

may also look into the Report of the Kerala and Madras Food Poisoning Cases Enquiry Commission and then take suitable action.

Shri V. P. Nayar: My point was that most of these poisons are controlled at least at the time of their arrival by the Government of India, so that it is necessary for the Government of India to formulate all the vigorous provisions.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I have already indicated that we will look into the matter.

Mr. Speaker: I shall formally put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is :

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

The motion was adopted.

12.51 hrs.

INDIAN ELECTRICITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Electricity Act, 1910, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House, namely: Sardar Hukam Singh; Shri Pondekanti Venkatasubbaiah; Shri Vinayak Rao K. Koratkar; Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi; Shri Chandramani Lal Choudhry; Shri Shree Narayan Das; Shri Shivram Rango Rane; Shri Ramappa Balappa Bidari; Shri K. R. Sambandam; Shri M. Ayyakkannu; Shri N. K. Pangarkar; Sardar Amar Singh Saigal; Shri M. G. Uikey; Shri Abdul Latif; Shri Pulin Behari Banerji; Shri Bhagwan Din Misra; Shri Ram Shanker Lal; Shrimati Krishna Mehta; Shri S. Hansda; Shri Diwan Chand Sharma; Shri

G. D. Somani, Shri K. T. K. Tangamani; Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair; Shri Shraddhkar Supakar; Shri Ignace Beck; Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel; Shri Baishnab Charan Mullick; Shri Premji R. Assar; Shri Braj Raj Singh, and Shri Jaisukhlal Lalshanker Hathi and 15 members from Rajya Sabha:

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee.

Sir, this is, in a way, a measure which seems to amend the existing Electricity Act of 1910; it is a non-controversial measure. We find that in 1910 the generation and consumption of electricity was very meagre compared to the present position. The Acts that were passed in 1887, 1893, 1903 and 1910 were passed having regard to the conditions then existing. The first Act of 1887 was passed only with a view to have some safety measures for the protection of life and property. There were not so many electric power generation plants then; there were no such large distribution lines or big hydro-electric power stations. So, in a way, that was an Act only for protecting life and property. Subsequently, in 1910 also, the Act that was passed took into consideration some other safety measures but it also provided for the terms and conditions on which licences should

[Shri Hathi]

be given—and revoked—for the use of electricity and the obligations of the licensees, etc. But even then the position was very different. For the information of the House. I may say that in 1910, there were only nineteen plants as against 451 in 1957. The power generating capacity in the public sector in 1910 was 15,000 kws. as against the present 1,683,000 kws. In the private sector the figure was 18,000 kws. as against 1203,000 kws. The total then was 31,000 kws as against the 29 lakh kws. now

We are making huge strides in the power generation and consumption in the country and it is necessary that the Act has to be amended with the changing circumstances. As is mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, the amendments are of four or five categories

One is that the rights given to the consumers with regard to or in relation to the private licensees are different from those of the State Governments. Wherever the State Government is distributing or supplying power, the same terms and conditions do not apply—those conditions which apply to the private licensees. It is, therefore, necessary that the consumers of power should have the same rights whether the power is supplied by the State Government or by a private undertaking. They must have the same benefits and no distinction so far as the consumers are concerned should be made with regard to the rights which they have. Therefore, that is one category of amendment which this measure seeks to enact.

Then, there is another amendment which this measure seeks to enact for the benefit of the consumers—the right to get electric connections. The rule at present is that if a distribution line is passing through a particular locality, and if a person residing in that locality wants electric power in that locality, six or more persons have to sign a requisition and guarantee a certain amount as a

return. Otherwise, they would not get connection. By this Bill, the number of persons who should request for the supply of power is reduced from 6 to 2. That means that any two persons can send a requisition and under the minimum guarantee that is to be given for the returns, they will have the power.

The third important amendment is this. We know that in big towns the landlords do not sometimes give facilities of electric connections to the tenants if they want that they should change the tenant somehow or the other. They are restricted from ejecting the tenants or terminating the tenancy under some legislations. There are other difficulties. Sometimes even though the tenant is prepared to pay all the charges and take connections for electricity, the landlord would not like to get the connections. The result is that the tenant suffers all the inconveniences and may have, perhaps, to vacate the premises. Very often it happens. We have an amendment here

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh) Which is that clause?

Shri Hathi: I think it is 11. Of course it will mean that the tenant who wants the connection, the persons who give the connections and the wiremen who do the work have to take all the precautions and see that the property is not damaged. That is only natural. That will be also subject to inspection. In fact all the safety precautions of the electric installations are taken.

13 hrs.

Whenever there are accidents or fires the electrical inspectors inspect and find out the causes of the accidents; why the fire took place or why the accident occurred. But there is a lacuna in that the inspector has not got the power to call people to tender evidence. The result is that some-

times either the enquiry is delayed or they do not get sufficient evidence on the strength of which they would be able to come to any particular conclusion. Therefore certain powers are sought to be given to the inspectors to summon witnesses, etc. With the expansion of electrical undertakings there are so many Central Government installations, inspection of which is necessary. Inspectors are to be appointed by the Central Government for the purpose of inspection of these installations.

Then there is an amendment which relates to supply of electric power to essential services. Sometimes private licensees would not give immediate priority to supply which is necessary for essential services. This amendment lays down that the essential services should be supplied with power.

Whenever a private individual wants electric connection the practice at present is that upto the first hundred feet the undertaking or the licensee has to meet the expense, for the remaining portion the consumer has to pay. Now when that particular undertaking is acquired by the State Government or Board or transfers hands otherwise, the question of compensation comes up, and disputes arise with regard to the cost of those lines. Now there is no specific provision as to what should be the basis. Here it is provided that whatever the consumer has paid for should not go to the licensee. If the licensee has spent only for the first hundred feet and the remaining expenditure has been borne by the consumer, in the calculation of compensation the licensee should get only for whatever he has spent and not for what the consumer has paid. There was no specific provision to this effect. It is now sought to be done by an amendment.

Sometimes the cost of street lighting is rather high. Although poles and supports of the private licensee existed they were not allowed to be used for the purpose of street lighting. These are small matters, but experience has revealed that without in-

fringement of rights we can reduce the cost without hardship to anybody if the undertaking's poles and supports are used for street-lighting either by the local bodies or by the State Governments. These are some amendments which are of a minor nature. They are non-controversial in character, but having regard to the various difficulties experienced by the consumers, the State Governments and local bodies, they are necessary.

According to the terms of the licence, licensees are required to do certain works with a particular time under an agreement. But there was no power to forfeit the security in case the licensee did not do that within the period, with the result that although they were required to do certain things, they would not do it, or, things were being delayed and the authorities had no power to forfeit the security, because it was not provided for. Various disputes took place on account of this. The proposed amendment gives power for the forfeiture of the security in case of non-fulfilment of a contract or agreement.

These are some of the important amendments. I would not like to take much time of the House. After all this Bill is being referred to a Joint Committee where hon. Members will have an opportunity to improve the Bill. The main idea is, as I submitted in the very beginning, that with the expansion of power we have to see that the consumers get the facilities of its use and power is not restricted by certain devices either on the part of the licensees or any other authority. The progress of a country is judged by the quantum of electricity consumed by it and as more and more electricity is consumed for industrial, agricultural and domestic purposes, we have to change the legislation to suit the changing conditions. A few years back there were only six hydro electric stations and a dozen diesel engine sets. There were not so many transmission lines or undertakings in the public sector. There were not so many thermal stations. The transmission lines consisted of about

[Shri Hathi]

thirty to forty miles in the Mysore State. With the expanding power potential in the country and increase in the number of consumers of electricity it was thought necessary that certain amendments should be made.

I would like to submit one point. This measure is something different from the one which the House passed, the Electricity (Amendment) Act, which provided for the creation of Electricity Boards. It was meant for coordinated development of power in the country. This Bill deals mainly with the terms and conditions of the licensees, under what circumstances they could be revoked, the terms of compensation in case of acquisition, the rights of consumers *vis a vis* private undertakings or licensees, the control which the State Government could exercise over them, etc. We have also provided that in the matter of amendment of terms and conditions of the licensees, the Electricity Boards which have been formed in all the States should be consulted. Naturally, they will play an important part.

Sir, these are some of the major amendments, which I have submitted before the House. I hope the House will accept the motion.

Raja Mahendra Pratap (Mathura): Sir, I have to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a very serious point. Perhaps you know, Sir, that there was a great strike by electrical workers. I intervened when they were on strike. When they went on hunger-strike, I went to the hon. Minister, Shri Patil, who was at that time in charge of this Ministry. He agreed that he would do everything to help those workers. I went and told that to the workers and they agreed to call off the strike. But after that Shri Patil told me that he did not mean that, he did not say that he would do everything. He did not do anything. Yesterday evening Shri Lakshmi Narayan, a great leader

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Hon. Member may kindly resume his seat.

Hon. Member is very industrious. I would request him to read the Rules of Procedure. I do not want to shut him out. Hon. Members here are anxious to hear him. I find that whenever he rises there is a certain amount of applause. Therefore, I do not want to deny him the privilege of addressing the House. But let me first of all place the motion before the House. After that, if he wants to speak on the motion I will allow him. If he wants to speak on other matters, he may communicate them. If Shri Patil is not here, Shri Hathi is here along with his chief.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I only wanted to point out what the hon. Minister is doing.

Mr. Speaker: Let me first place the motion before the House. If he wants to speak I will allow him after I have placed the motion before the House. Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Electricity Act, 1910, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House, namely, Sardar Hukam Singh, Shri Pendekanti Venkatasubbaiah, Shri Vinayak Rao K. Koratkar, Shri Maneklal Maganlal Gandhi, Shri Chandramani Lal Choudhry; Shri Shree Narayan Das; Shri Shivram Rango Rane; Shri Ramappa Balappa Bidari; Shri K. R. Sambandam, Shri M. Ayyakkannu; Shri N. K. Pangarkar; Sardar Amar Singh Saigal; Shri M. G. Uiker, Shri Abdul Latif; Shri Pulun Behari Banerji, Shri Bhagwan Din Misra; Shri Ram Shanker Lal; Shrimati Krishna Mehta; Shri S. Hansa; Shri Diwan Chand Sharma; Shri G. D. Somani; Shri K. T. K. Tangamani; Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair; Shri Shraddhkar Supakar; Shri Ignance Beck; Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel; Shri Baishnab Charan Mullick; Shri Premji R. Assar; Shri Braj Raj Singh and Shri Jaisukhlal Lalshanker Hathi and 15 members

from Rajya Sabha that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respect the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I want to know whether these people who have been recommended as members of this committee know anything about this strike. Do they know anything about this fact that Shri Lakshmi Narayan came to me yesterday and told me that they are going to strike once again? I am very much against strikes. I even suggested to him that he should go to Shri Pande or approach Pandit Pant so that there may not be any strike. I only want to ask the hon. Minister whether there are some people on this Committee who know about the strike which was a very serious one when Shri Patil was there. Do they know anything of this new fact that a strike might be declared and then the whole of Delhi will be in darkness?

Mr. Speaker: The House is now fully aware of it. If the hon. Member wants to give further information, he can offer to give evidence before the committee. If the committee likes, and the matter which he wants to convey to the committee is considered to be relevant by the committee, then he will be called upon by the committee to give evidence.

Shri Nanshir Bharucha: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was rather surprised when the hon. Minister introducing this Bill said that this was non-controversial. In fact, the amending Bill leaves out many things, and it is necessary that the House should concentrate attention on these points.

In the first place, the major question, namely the question of nationalising electrical enterprise, has been completely side-tracked. Though in the Statement of Objects and Reasons the hon. Minister mentions that the views of the private enterprise have been considered, Sir, I should like to know whether, when we are making amendments to this Act regarding the method and manner in which private electrical enterprise might be taken over either by the State Electricity Board or by the State Government or by the Municipality, it would not be worthwhile for this House to lay down once and for all a policy for nationalisation of electrical undertakings.

It appears to me that the Government of India have not made up their mind on this vital question. I should like to ask the hon. Minister why this opportunity is not being taken in making this amendment to lay down the policy which, I think, the Government is in agreement with.

In the first place, let us consider this aspect of nationalisation. Today we are amending this Act and we are prescribing priorities with regard to option which might be exercised by certain bodies for the purchase of certain enterprises. Assuming for a moment that the licence of a private licensee has been revoked, according to the priorities prescribed in this particular amending Bill the State Electricity Board is first asked to exercise its option of purchase. On the refusal of the State Electricity Board to take it over the State Government is given the next option. If the State Government also does not take it over, then the local authority of that particular area has the option. If

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

even the local authority is not willing then, very probably, another private entrepreneur would come and take its place. I ask the Government whether it would not have been wise in the first place, instead of laying down these various priorities, to make it obligatory on the State Electricity Board to take over such private enterprises the licences of which have been revoked for some default or other. That would be one way of making a beginning with nationalisation of electrical enterprises.

Sir, it might be argued that there might be cases in which the cost of purchase might be so great that the resources of the State Electricity Board might not suffice. Here I would ask the Government to consider seriously the question that once and for all a policy may be laid down that whenever, for purposes of nationalisation, any commercial or industrial undertaking is taken over, the purchase price need not be paid in cash but it may be paid in interest-bearing transferable bonds. This is not a new principle which I am laying down. This principle has been accepted by the Government of Bombay. When we did away with *inam* lands and various types of tenure savouring of zamindari, the State did not pay cash; it paid the compensation in the form of interest-bearing transferable bonds redeemable, after a period of 20 years or so.

Therefore, while we are now amending the Act and saying that in the case of private enterprises which are not able to function for one reason or other and the licences of which are being cancelled the option to take over them should be offered to various bodies one after the other, one should have thought that the Government should have come forward with a proposal that it should be made obligatory on the State Electricity Board to take over such enterprises. Therefore, in the most fundamental point,

namely, the question of policy that this Government should adopt with regard to nationalisation of electrical undertakings, the Bill is not only silent but it moves in a retrograde direction, and that is a big defect so far as this Bill is concerned.

The second point to which I desire to invite the attention of this House is, I am not against private enterprise entering in this field for a limited number of years and acting under certain rules and regulations. It may not be possible all of a sudden to evolve a policy whereby we can cut out all private enterprise in this field. But I submit that a beginning can be made and a beginning should be made, and I should like to know whether the Government has thought over this policy at all.

Also, I am of the view that a beginning should be made by restricting the percentage of profits and also restricting certain privileges in the licence. It is a good thing that the Government has taken powers for amending the provisions of licenses. I do not know how far they will be exercised in the nation's interest, but I presume that these powers will enable the Government, if the Government is so minded, to proceed with nationalization gradually.

One of the reasons why we insist upon nationalization, apart from the fact that the profits of a nationalized concern would be diverted to the nation's exchequer, is that the consumer must get the benefit out of such enterprises. The hon. Minister in the course of his speech has pointed out that the consumer is being benefited. In fact, if we turn to the Statement of Objects and Reasons, we find that the objects of the Bill are to enlarge the scope of the facilities for the consumers of electricity. My grievance is that this so-called scope of facilities is still very narrow, and the consumer requires relief in many directions, some of which I shall point out.

I could appreciate one of the things in respect of which the hon. Minister seeks an amendment, namely, clause 11, giving powers to the occupier to give his consent for reception of electrical energy, a consent which was hitherto denied by the landlord and often arbitrarily. But I am afraid even as the amendment stands, it will not help the occupier much and for two reasons. First, assuming I am a tenant in a particular building and I desire to take electrical energy, I apply to the licensee for giving me a connection, the landlord must be consulted, but I myself, notwithstanding this amendment, may not be free to give my consent as a tenant, because of two reasons: first, I may be prevented by the terms of tenancy from giving any such consent. Secondly, in the Bombay Rent Act, as the provisions stand now, no structure can be altered without the consent of the landlord and that becomes a good ground for ejecting the tenant. Therefore, unless the amendment is comprehensive enough to say that notwithstanding anything contained either in any of the Rent Acts or in the Transfer of Property Act or in any of the terms of tenancy, consent may be given by an occupier, I am afraid the facility which you seek to give is likely to be rendered nugatory. I would like the Minister to consider that matter also.

The consumer requires relief in many respects. I speak with some experience, because I have been a member of the Bombay Electric Supply and Transport Undertaking for a period of six years, and I know what the difficulties of the consumers are. First, let us begin with the question of the new consumer requiring supply of electrical energy. In regard to the supply of electrical energy, I notice that the hon. Minister has reduced the number of persons required from six to two. But is that enough? If the minimum guarantee that is required to be given which has been put down at 15 per cent....

Shri Hathi: The number of persons has been reduced from six to two.

There, what happens is, the undertaking, according to their own calculation, demand any amount as guarantee for two years. We have, therefore, fixed that such guarantee should be 15 per cent, on the cost of transmission equipment excluding the sub-station, I may make that clear that purely on the transmission line expenditure, 15 per cent guarantee is given.

We have prescribed that limit, otherwise, it was not there. Formerly the guarantee varied from undertaking to undertaking and they could ask anything for the security amount.

Mr. Speaker: They want only 10 per cent.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Hissar): Supposing it is one per cent.

Shri Hathi: The calculation might differ.

Mr. Speaker: I understood the other day that they have have proposed to reduce it from 10 or 11 to eight per cent. Progressively it should be made cheaper instead of putting it up to 15 per cent. Subsidies are given to various schools and colleges and hospitals and so on, but with respect to the affected areas where the main source for irrigation is water-supply, especially in backward areas, the hon. Minister, in spite of the best of wishes, cannot spend a single pie on any big project, and so the question is whether it should not be a cheap, commercial method. 15 per cent seems to be on the heavy side.

Shri Hathi: It is 'not exceeding' that.

Mr. Speaker: You can say 'not exceeding 100 per cent'! Though the discretion is there, the discretion must be limited.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: My experience has been that, in the Committee, we used to receive numerous applications from the new consumers and the officers of the Committee used to bring

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

an estimate for many hundreds yards of cables to be laid and saying so much is the expenditure involved in granting the connection and therefore a minimum guarantee of income must be given from the new consumers. What I am pointing out is that it is absolutely unfair; it is an outmoded and old-fashioned rule. Take, for instance, a locality which is gradually developing and where, to begin with, two new consumers come forward. Is it fair and just that those two consumers must bear the burden of laying down the cable as if the company or the licensee has no prospect of further developing that area? What I am pointing out is that if it is really desired to make available electrical energy to new consumers, we must progress further and therefore the burden on the initial consumers must be as low as possible. What the present amendment seeks to do is

Mr Speaker: Is there no provision that though in the initial stage all the weight and burden has to be shared or borne only by two people who want it, the burden could be lightened for others who want it, later on? Is not the burden lightened within a period of say, four or five years? The people who want it first could be thought of as promoters so far as this is concerned, they having come sooner. But some people are waiting to see immediately, to throw the burden on one person does not seem to be just. Is it justice?

Shri Hathi: I think this point will have to be considered. I also feel like that.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; in the Joint Committee. It may also be considered whether in an area where there is no source of irrigation, except perhaps well-supply for water, you cannot reduce it and where you may not be so strict. The reduction from eight to two seems only to favour the rich men and not the poor men. There is no harm if they by themselves take it up. **¶** the hon. Minister can kindly

consider this aspect and see that whatever measures are provided for here must be suited to the capacity of the poorer section of the country, it may be good.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: What I was suggesting, therefore, was that the Act which we are called upon to amend is an half a century old statute, and therefore there are very old, outmoded ideas which required radical revision. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister one thing. Since this Bill is going to the Joint Committee, I would request the Committee to consider this aspect. I am of the opinion that where there is a developed locality or a locality which is likely to develop, then it should be made obligatory on the licensee to provide the necessary distribution mains but no type of minimum guarantee should be asked for, because, our experience has always been that wherever we have laid new mains, within a period of two or three years we are called upon to enlarge the mains because of demand rising to a great extent. On account of this minimum guarantee, new areas remain undeveloped. There are no people coming forward, and this is a grave hardship on the consumer. Particularly on the industrial consumers who colonize uninhabited localities, this would be of great importance.

The second point is that as a consumer, my experience and our experience has been that the bills prepared for the consumption of electrical energy, whether for domestic purposes or for domestic equipment or for industrial purposes, are often highly inflated. It has been my own unfortunate experience, so far as the New Delhi Municipal Committee's Electrical Branch is concerned, and the bills vary, for instance, for power supply, anything from 235 units down to 75. Surely the consumption does not vary so widely. I wrote to the New Delhi Municipal Committee six letters, but there was

not even an acknowledgment. This is not a complaint from me only. It is a general complaint from everybody and it has appeared in the newspapers also. Then I wrote to the Home Department asking them to try and ask for a reply. The Home Department wrote a letter and then the Secretary of the Electric Supply Committee wrote to me that "the files of your papers are lost". Because I happened to be an M. P. and contacted the Home Department, I could get this much reply. What about the poor consumers?

I want the hon. Minister to amend this Act making it obligatory on every licensee to reply to every complaint from the consumers, because if the inflated bills are not paid, the electric supply will be cut off. There is no remedy whatsoever. It is no use saying that the consumer can go to court, because I cannot go to the court for Rs. 25. Even if I go to the court, they can bring lawyers and make it impossible for any consumer to obtain redress. If you really want the consumer to get relief, in that case, my suggestion is that first of all you must lay down in the Act that the licensee shall reply to any letter of complaint addressed by a consumer if it is sent by registered post. This is not a new suggestion. It is already incorporated in the Bombay Police Act. If the owner of a motor-car does not reply to any enquiry from the police department, it becomes a criminal offence. So, the first step in curbing the arbitrary powers of licensees is to make it a legal obligation in the Act that they should reply to complaints.

Also it is no use telling the consumer that his meter will be tested provided he pays Rs. 6. I submit that some simple procedure should be laid down by the creation of some sort of a tribunal which will be empowered to fix the charges for domestic supply in the event of any difference between the consumer and the licensee. I would also put it down that periodic checking of meters should be made an obligation on the licensee. It is no

use saying that if I pay Rs. 5, then only my meter will be checked. The fees for checking meters should be reduced to, say, 8 annas. I do not see anything extraordinary about checking of meters. These are old ideas which required to be revised.

Mr. Speaker: Are not the readings taken month after month?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Yes, but the difficulty is this. In the consumers' department, meter-readers are provided. They generally go to a place at random and take the reading, and after that the bill is prepared. One month I get a bill for 75 units and in another month I get a bill for 235 units. Sometimes after two or three months, the meter readers take readings.

Mr. Speaker: Is not the signature of the owner taken then and there? As a matter of fact, in my house, the meter was wrong and showed 50 more units. I wanted refund; it is still pending.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): Sometimes after a year we get the bill.

Raja Mahendra Pratap: I propose that this gentleman, Mr. Bharucha, must be put on the committee.

Mr. Speaker: If he were on the committee, he would not have spoken at all.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Coming to the question of the constitution of the Central Electrical Board, as usual, it is a body which is completely packed with Government officers and the interests of either the licensees or the consumers are not represented. I would rather alter this clause of the Bill, so that there may be at least two members who will represent consumers' interests and one or two members representing interests of private electrical enterprises. This is very necessary, if the board is to be truly representative. Otherwise, they would only look to the administrative side of the question and the question of given relief to the

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

consumer will go by default. So, I request that the composition of the board should be altered accordingly.

Coming to page 11 of Bill, you will find that a new clause has been instituted namely, preference should be given in the matter of new supply to certain bodies such as:

- (a) any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or the State Government; or
- (b) any other establishment notified by the State Government in the Official Gazette, being an establishment which in the opinion of the State Government, is essential to the life of the community.

At first sight it appears that Government establishments should be given preference in the matter of supply of electrical energy. But it is not so actually. There are enterprises in which Government is interested only commercially. Government enters into those enterprises as nothing more than an ordinary trader and I do not see why the Government, because it possesses the power, must get preference in the matter of getting supply over other private enterprises. I do not understand why because the Government runs a steel factory, it must obtain priority in the matter of supply as compared to any other public company, which may be performing the same useful function. Therefore, I strongly object to Government establishments being given preference in the matter of supply.

Government have also acquired the the power in the Bill for control, regulation and distribution of electrical energy. This was a long overdue measure which the Government should have brought long before. Anyway, I would invite the attention of the House to one thing, namely, this power would probably be used in case of breakdowns, failures, scarcity of power supply, etc. Before using this

power for one reason or the other, the principles and policies should be formulated. The circumstances in which the power would be used, in what proportion the distribution will be made, etc. should be laid down clearly. These should not be left to the will of the Government.

Taking it as a whole, I find that in all important points with which the House is vitally concerned and on which the House would like to know the opinion of the Government, the Bill is completely silent. I think the time has now come for this House once and for all to decide that in a matter of public utility service like the supply of electrical energy, it shall be the concern of the State and private enterprise must be gradually eliminated. I have already said that there is no question of payment of compensation, because compensation can be paid in interest bearing transferable bonds. If these things are done, I am sure we can be properly set on the road to progress and development of important projects.

I hope the Committee will bear in mind the various suggestions which I have made and amend the Bill accordingly, even if it would mean a revolutionary departure from out-moded ideas.

13.35 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Shri Narayanankutty Menon (Mukundapuram): Though the scope of the Bill is only to amend the original Electricity Act of 1910, certain fundamental principles which govern the whole policy of the Government of India towards electricity are highlighted as far as this Bill is concerned. When the Government comes forward with a piece of legislation, whether it is amending or substantive in character, the legislation itself is a subjective reflection of the Government's own policy for the time being and

also objectively, it is a reflection of the implementation of the Government's policies. About 44 years ago, the then existing British Government in India enacted a legislation which was for that particular time comprehensive. Later on, circumstances began to change and in 1948, after independence, another Act was passed which comprehensively covers the entire field of electricity, including matters covered by this piece of legislation which is sought to be passed in this House today. The later Act was passed far far earlier when electricity had no significance, as far as this country was concerned, both as a question of economic policy and as a question of political policy. After such a long number of years, when the very conception of our political economy has undergone such a change at the hands of this own government, if the government comes down with only a piece of amending legislation, certainly it is a serious reflection on the Government's policy or lack of policy, as far as electricity is concerned.

I take this opportunity to bring forward before this House a review of the Government's own electrical policy so that the House may be aware that in passing this legislation we are not, at least for the time being, closing the chapter as to what all should be said about electricity. Every hon. Member of the House knows that electricity plays such an important part, as far as the economy of a particular country is concerned. It becomes all the more important in a country like ours, which had such a colossal backward economy, being under the British colonial rule for more than 200 years, and which is trying to jump across an era of 200 years of development, as far as the industrialisation of the country is concerned. A reference has been made in the big book which purports to tell us about the findings of the Committee which sat from 1953 onwards and which went into the matter, saying what are the amendments which are to be brought forward as

a piece of legislation to the original Electricity Act.

A very illuminating factor, as far as the terms of reference is concerned, is that the Committee was asked by the Government of India to take into consideration the legislation existing in other countries in relation to matters connected with electricity before finalising their report. So, it is so disappointing to note that a high-power Committee appointed by the Government of India to make recommendations, as far as amendments to the parent Act are concerned, and also about a comprehensive piece of legislation, failed to make any substantial improvement in the Act by taking into account the legislation that is existing in other countries. As this Bill is going to a Select Committee, I submit that it is very high time that the Government comes forward at least with a categorical declaration of their electrical policy, instead of appointing committees at random which go into certain Acts, and then come forward with a Bill, which can only be a piece-meal legislation which touches only a small part of the whole subject.

Going into the 1910 Act and also the developments that were there, as far as that Act was concerned, we find that the question of amending this Act arose even as early as 1928. Certain draft pieces of legislation were prepared and the only excuse that is given today is that because of the intervention of the war in 1939 no legislation could be brought forward during the war period and so the matter could not be seriously thought over and, therefore, Government waited till this time to bring forward this legislation and, in the meantime, they appointed a Committee. But, in 1948 when the Government came forward with the Electricity Supply Bill in the Parliament what prevented the Government from bringing a comprehensive and composite piece of legislation including in it all the points that are now included in this Bill? There is no reasonable excuse given by the

[Shri Narayanankutty Menon]

Government for not bringing that legislation. Even though that is a matter of procedural character, that factor alone reflects the fact that the Government today has no integrated policy, as far as either production or supply of electricity is concerned, and that is also reflected in bringing forward such a piece-meal legislation.

The Second Five Year Plan contemplates big industrial advance, as far as the country is concerned, and according to indications and also the declared policy of the Government in accordance with the socialistic pattern of society the tempo of industrial development of the country has to take additional impetus during the Third and Fourth Plan periods. If our country has to develop and our industrial tempo has to develop, and you say and also according to your policy, is it good enough that even today you do not have a concrete policy as far as electricity is concerned, which is the very basic and vital element in the industrialisation of the country?

Certainly I can say that the Government's policy or lack of policy in the matter of electricity is a misnomer and whatever policy has been declared by Government has been undergoing constant change at the hands of some other sources in the country. They are making very valid assessment as to how far the Government will go during the Second Five Year Plan and the Third Five Year Plan. I will read for the benefit of the hon. Minister a document which was sent by the Burmah-Shell Oil Storage and Distributing Co., of India Limited to their London office, giving a fair assessment of the pattern of average consumption and production in India till the year 1969. And reading that document I wonder who is planning the policy on electricity, which is the policy on our own economy. Is it the private enterprise which has come from foreign lands or the Government of India or the Planning Commission? It is surprising and most disappointing that a Company which imports fuel,

another form of energy, makes its own estimate for the future supply and production and import of fuel from foreign countries, basing its conclusions on its own experience of the inner details of the Government of India and the working of electricity undertakings. It declared that the Government of India is only talking in terms of increased production of electricity and that they are convinced that even during the Third Plan these talks will remain only in air. Therefore, they calculate that in 1969 more and more fuel will be imported. I will read out only two lines which are very illuminating and self-explanatory.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Member know anything about the authenticity of the document?

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: As far as I am concerned, this document is genuine.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He was pleased to tell us that it was a communication from the Company to its parent office. Therefore, it is difficult to conceive how the hon. Member can check up its authenticity. Anyhow, he must make sure that it is a genuine document.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: As far as the document is concerned, I have tried myself to verify the authenticity, the sources from which I have received etc. It is left for you to decide. Personally, I am convinced that it is a genuine document.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Many things are to be taken into consideration. Only the hon. Member knows the sources from which he got it, whether they are reliable etc. How can I decide at once whether it is genuine or not? It is for the Member to decide.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: That is why I am pointing out this. As the circumstances stand today, the Government of India should know the

estimates of the oil companies, because foreign exchange is involved. Therefore, it is only for the purpose of scrutiny by Government that I am placing this document here. I am prepared to read out two sentences from that document. It is only for the information of the hon. Members and the Government which may verify it from their own sources.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then that shall have to be placed on the Table of the House

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I am prepared to place it on the Table. The document is entitled "FORWARD ESTIMATES OF TRADING 1959—1963 (FINAL) & 1968" Under the heading "ADVANCE OF THE GRID" it is stated on page 9:

"We do not envisage any effect on off-take from the Grid bill till such time as Government develop rural electrification on a large scale. At present they are only on the fringe of the problem and we doubt whether any significant progress will be made even by the end of the Third Plan period. By the end of the Second Plan period it is estimated by Government that about 3 per cent of India's 5½ lakh villages would be electrified."

Shri Hathi: By the second?

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: By the Second Five Year Plan period. Their own estimate. As far as this particular document is concerned, I place it on the Table.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is all right. It is only an estimate by a company. What they think that the Government might do. There is nothing.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I attach great importance to this. It is based upon this estimate that they are making their own financial plans and the plans for the import of other

types of fuel in which they are trading, till the year 1969. When such a company, having such international ramifications and reputation for trade makes such an estimate, certainly they have got something to do as far as our country is concerned and I have specifically pointed out this to show in terms of this piece of legislation the manner in which the Government is dealing with this particular aspect. And also taking into consideration certain other estimates by independent sources, certainly, I can say that the Government's own policy is no policy at all. And, especially at this time, I take this opportunity to tell the Government that the Government should come forward with a categorical declaration of policy and also the machinery and the legislation so that that policy may be implemented.

Shri Hathi: I want to clear point of information. Was this communication from the Government to somebody or from a private individual to another individual?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: By a private individual firm to their own office; their assessment of the situation, what they think that the Government might do in the coming years.

Shri Hathi: Under the Second Five Year Plan.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: What they might do in the coming years plus what they think what they should do in the coming years.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is for them to think what they should do.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: That also is there.

Shri Hathi: How can we stop that?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member wants only to press this much that the policy of the Government as it is being pursued now is being view-

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

ed by other firms in this manner,— what they think of the policy—and according to that they are phasing their programmes and their own finances and other things.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: That is right.

The second factor is regarding the observations made by my hon. friend Shri Naushir Bharucha regarding the question of nationalisation. Even when this Bill is drafted and certain safeguards are sought to be given, in respect of Electricity Boards, as far as the so-called private sector in this industry is concerned, the Government has not evolved a policy whether the Government is going to encourage the development of private enterprise in the production and supply of electricity or progressively, in the future, Government is going to follow a policy whereby the private sector which is already existing in the Electricity field is going to be eliminated. There is lack of declaration of the Government's policy as far as the private sector is concerned. One important aspect that can be seen from this whole affair is, this Bill or the provisions which relate to the private sector is not the result of the Government's policy in Electricity, that it is to be incorporated in the public sector and whatever our future development in the Electricity field should be in the public sector, but because of certain difficulties felt by the Government, when the private sector holds certain cities and also certain undertakings and also consumers to ransom in the past few years. It is only to meet this emergency that the Government has come forward, because the whole pattern of the amendments reflects the need to avoid certain difficulties that they have come across. In the past, we have seen in many places in India the private enterprise which has been in the field for a long time holding these public utility concerns and the benefactors, especially the different

public utility concerns and the consuming public to ransom because of their own actions. An attempt is being made by the Government to rectify certain mistakes and also to make some provisions whereby the Government can step in. How far these provisions are satisfactory is a matter to be examined today. The Joint Committee, of course, will be going into the details. When the Joint Committee goes into the details of the proposals, certain basic principles are also involved.

The first point is the provision in the Bill today that when private undertakings are taken by the Government or by Electricity Boards or by public local authorities, the nature of the compensation that has to be paid is the fair market price. It is so innocuous as the hon. Minister said when he read it in so many lines. But, the question of practical implementation of this comes in different States and also in different places. Sometimes you will find it impossible to take a whole thing on a commercially profitable scale. Our own price structure of certain machinery which we used to import in the 1930-1940 period and the 1940-1950 period and the foreign exchange position in the international market was so low. Today, because of the foreign exchange difficulties and because of the non-availability of certain types of machinery because they are not being manufactured by the original manufacturers, in the international market, the prices of those machinery have shot up considerably. Irrespective of the book value of this machinery, the actual cost and even 10 to 15 times the actual cost of the machinery have been already taken from the profits by these concerns. If you take a comparative standard, of the market price regarding certain types of machinery, even after taking 10 to 15 times of the price, we will have to pay 10 to 15 times the original price that they have paid. That is the real state of

affairs if this principle of fair market price is going to be applied. In the case of many electrical concerns, if you directly apply what is provided in this Bill, fair market price, it is impossible to find out the fair market price for particular pieces of machinery because that type of machinery is not available in the Indian market today, that type of machinery is not available in the international market today. What is the criterion? What is the basis on which any evaluating authority will decide on a fair and reasonable price, as far as this machinery is concerned?

I submit, first of all, that there is no morality behind it when we are not expropriating any private property as far as this is concerned. The alternative suggestion which the Government could have brought forward is, as in the case of private property or properties of private companies, the book value correctly represents without any appreciation the real value that a private individual or company has invested in it. What is immoral or what is improper and what is the injustice involved if the book value of certain types of machinery which have been there in the company is paid to it for the purpose of taking over a concern due to certain types of misconduct by the private undertaking itself? Because, we contemplate only revocation of a licence in certain circumstances. My submission is that it will create numerous difficulties and an impossible situation to the various State Governments when confronted with such circumstances that unless the price as laid down in this Act is paid by them, the undertaking could not be taken over. Under the law, if these companies are to be paid the price provided here, it will be not a reasonable bargain; it will be impossible for many Governments to purchase the private undertakings. Therefore, the whole purpose of this amending Bill will be defeated because of this provision alone. My submission is this. The Joint Committee should seriously consider about the method of compensation that is to

be given to the private undertakings when the private undertakings are taken over, and also the reasonable way in which this compensation could be paid and also the procedure and the machinery whereby this reasonable compensation could be fixed. These are the minimum things to be provided for in order to avoid difficulties likely to be encountered by the State Governments and local authorities whenever these private undertakings are taken over by them.

14 hrs.

There is another important aspect concerning this Bill as well as the Indian Electricity Supply Act of 1948. Because of the peculiar nature of this legislation, because of the just controls which this legislation imposes upon the profits of these undertakings, a very serious situation has arisen, and a large number of workmen in these undertakings, both private and public, are not entitled to get a legitimate share of the profit as other workmen are getting. The Government will be well aware that because of certain legal restrictions and also restrictions on the distribution of profits in this industry, workmen in many electricity undertakings cannot get their share in the profit even though their brethren in other industries do get it. As the hon. Minister is aware, the Indian Electricity Supply Act provides how the profits of the electricity boards and also the electrical undertakings are to be distributed, and the Government knows very well that by applying the principles of the so-called Bombay formula, no worker will be entitled to get bonus. That is one difficulty.

The second difficulty is that in the States when the electricity workers quite reasonably, in comparison with other industrial workers, ask for more wages and bonus, the electricity boards are not in a position to grant the demands because of the statutory restrictions in the Indian Electricity Act and the Indian Electricity Supply Act. I appeal to the hon. Minister

[Shri Narayanankutty Menon]

and also to the Members of the Joint Committee that this particular question which has undergone judicial scrutiny many times by the labour appellate tribunal during 1955 and 1956 . . .

Shri Hathi: I think we have made that amendment in the Electricity Supply Act of 1948. We made that amendment about the question of bonus.

Shri Narayanankutty Menon: I am aware that after the appellate tribunal ruling an amendment was made, but unfortunately even though that amendment was made, it has not yielded any result because the interpretation of the sharing of profit and of cost structure remains today the same. It is quite salutary that profits be limited by legislation as also the sharing of the profits. At the same time, the limitation that is imposed upon the distribution of profits should not in any way affect the rights of the workmen in regard to their wages or bonus.

My last submission is—a lot of details regarding that has been mentioned by my hon. friend Shri Bharucha—that the whole approach should be that, whatever be the difficulties, electricity should be made available at a cheaper rate to as many people as possible, especially in the rural areas where considerable difficulty is being experienced on the irrigation side regarding the rates as also in getting the electric supply line to particular localities. The main difficulty is that a premium has to be paid if electricity is to go to a particular locality. Top priority should be given to food production, and irrigation is a basic factor in food production. So, where electricity is to be consumed for irrigation purposes, all these conditions of the payment of premium, number of consumers etc., must be exempted. Also, in the supply of electricity in the rural areas for the purpose of power consumption, certain concessions may be given, so that difficulties will not

arise in the consumption of electricity either for irrigation or power purposes.

There are many clauses in the Bill which require reasonable alterations, but these are to be looked into by the Joint Committee, and a full-fledged discussion will be there in the House after the Joint Committee reports on the matter. My only request is that the Joint Committee, instead of confining its discussion and review to the amending Bill alone, should, with a broad perspective, start from 1910 onwards when the original Electricity Act was passed, review the history of all the legislation including the 1928 draft and also the Electricity Supply Act of 1948, and, if possible, make it a compact and codified legislation removing all the difficulties in the various legislations, so that Government can with more ease go forward with implementing its own policy. I hope the Joint Committee will take all these aspects into consideration instead of confining itself to the amendments put forward in this Bill alone.

श्री नवल प्रभाकर (बाबू दिल्ली—
रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : उपाध्यक्ष
महोदय, यह जो बिजली संशोधन बिल हमारे
गामने है उस के मिनिसिले में मैं अपने निर्वाचन
क्षेत्र में जो लोगों को निजी कम्पनियों से
कठिनाई उठानी पड़ रही है उसके बारे में
प्रकाश डालना चाहता हूँ ।

मेरा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र नरेला है । वहाँ पर
एक निजी बिजली कम्पनी है जिसको सरकार
ने लाइसेंस दिया हुआ है । पर उसकी रेट बहुत
ऊँची है । जब कि यहाँ दिल्ली में साढ़े तीन घाने
प्रति यूनिट के हिसाब से बिजली मिलती है
तो नरेला में जो एक छोटा सा कसबा है वस
घाने प्रति यूनिट पर बिजली दी जाती है ।
यह जो इतना भारी अन्तर है वह मेरी समझ
में मितना चाहिए । भारत से जो बिजली

दिल्ली को छाती है वह नरेला के पास में खुबरती है। वहाँ पर दिल्ली बिजली सप्लाई अथॉरिटी ने एक खम्भा भी खड़ा कर दिया है किन्तु कुछ कानूनी दिक्कतें ऐसी आ गयी हैं जिनकी वजह से नरेला के लोगो को दिल्ली की तरह सस्ती बिजली नहीं मिल पाती और यह जो निजी कम्पनी है वह वहाँ के लोगो को तरह तरह से परेशान करती रहती है। कभी वह कम्पनी अदालत में इज्जतान अर्द्धर ले लेती है और कभी और बाधाये खड़ी कर देती है जिनके कारण वहाँ पर सस्ती बिजली नहीं पहुँच पाती।

कम्पनी की ओर से वहाँ पर कुछ नाजायज कार्रवाई भी होती है। मैं वहाँ गया तो मैं ने देखा कि वहाँ पर हर कच्चे घर को कम से कम एक खाम कीमत तो देनी ही पडती है। चाहे एक कज्यूर दो यूनिट ही बिजली जलाये पर उसे वह खास कीमत तो देनी ही होगी। जहाँ तक मुझे खयाल है वह कम से कम कीमत दो रुपया दस घाना है। अब अगर एक कज्यूर दो यूनिट बिजली जलाता है तो भी उसको दो रुपया दस घाना तो देना ही होगा, यानी उसको एक यूनिट बिजली एक रुपये और पाच घाने की पडेगी। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह जो अन्तर है यह हटाना चाहिए। मैं तो यह कहना कि दिल्ली के ग्रासपाम के जो कसबे हैं वहाँ पर दिल्ली से बिजली जानी चाहिए और यह जो निजी कम्पनिया है इनको तुरन्त हटा देना चाहिए। इस कम्पनी से वहाँ पर बड़ा भारी असतोष है। इस सम्बन्ध में पहले राज्य सरकार को भी मैं ने कई बार लिखा था पर इस दिशा में कोई काम नहीं हुआ। अब कारपोरेशन बन गया है और अब बिजली के वितरण का काम कारपोरेशन के हाथ में चला गया है। कारपोरेशन से भी इस बारे में काफी लिखा-वड़ी हुई है। कारपोरेशन बिजली देना चाहता है किन्तु जो कानूनी दिक्कतें हैं उनके कारण लोगों को बिजली नहीं मिल पाती। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस विल में कोई ऐसा प्रावीजन

होना चाहिए कि ये निजी कम्पनियां जो धड़गाबाजी लगाती हैं उसका रास्ता बिल्कुल बन्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए और जनता को जो लाभ मिल सकता है उसका रास्ता खोल देना चाहिए।

यहाँ पर दिल्ली में जो बिजली दी जाती है तो उस सिलमिले में मीटर की सीक्योरिटी के नाम से एक खास रकम जमा करवायी जाती है। और यह देखा गया है कि यह सीक्योरिटी की रकम इतनी होती है कि इससे एक नया मीटर ही खरीदा जा सकता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यदि यह रकम देने के बजाये कोई उस रकम में अपना मीटर खरीद कर लगाना चाहे तो उसको ऐसा करने की पूरी छूट होनी चाहिए। जो बिजली सप्लाई करने वाली कम्पनी है वह यह देख ले कि यह मीटर ठीक से काम कर रहा है या नहीं। यहाँ पर दिल्ली में कज्यूर को रुपया जमा करना पडता है और साथ ही ६ घाना महीना मीटर का किराया भी अलग से देना पडता है। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि या तो मीटर का किराया ही ले लिया जाये करे या यह रकम ही ले लें। परन्तु हो यह रहा है कि मीटर की सीक्योरिटी के नाम पर भी एक रकम ली जाती है और प्रति मास उसके लिए किराया भी लिया जाता है। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि यदि कोई आदमी अपना मीटर नहीं लगा सकता तो उस हालत में बिजली कम्पनी या जो मसबा बिजली वितरण करती है वह या तो उसका किराया ले ले या सीक्योरिटी की रकम ले ले। इस विल में इस तरह का कोई प्रावीजन होना चाहिए।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। वह यह कि यहाँ पर दिल्ली में घरेलू उपयोग के लिए बिजली बहुत कम मिलती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह ज्यादा मिलनी चाहिए। ग्राम पास की जो कालोनीज हैं उनमें भी बिजली की बहुत कमी है। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि लोगों को अधिक से अधिक बिजली मिलनी चाहिए।

[श्री नवल प्रसाद]

एक सुझाव मैं धीर देना चाहता हूँ। दिल्ली में बड़े-बड़े दफ्तर हैं, जहाँ सारे दिन बिजली जलती है, पंखे चलते हैं, हीटर जलते हैं। किन्तु रात के समय यह बिजली बिल्कुल खाली रहती है। तो मेरा एक किन्तु सुझाव यह है कि दिल्ली में जो करीब ३०० माघ हैं उनको रात के समय यह बिजली बंदी जाया करे। इससे किसानों को बहुत लाभ हो सकता है और इससे पैसाधार बढ़ाने में भी बहुत सहायता मिल सकती है, और जो बिजली के खर्च बढ़ने से नुकसान होता है वह भी नहीं होगा। जो मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल में कोई इस तरह का ही प्रावधान कर दिया जाये कि रात के समय दिल्ली के किसानों को बिजली मिल सके ताकि वे अपने कुर्बों से सिंचाई धारि करने के काम में उसे का सकते हैं। यह सुझाव कुर्बों के निर्वासन क्षेत्र में भी लोगों ने किया है। उनका कहना है कि यदि रात को यह बिजली उनको मिल जाये तो इससे वे अच्छी तरह सिंचाई कर सकते हैं। तो मैं समझता हूँ कि प्राचीन मन्त्री जी इस तरह ध्यान देने और अगर सम्भव होगा तो इस बिल में इस प्रकार का प्रावधान कर देंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय लेकिन अगर रात को बिजली गांवों में खर्च हो गयी तो प्रान्तों के लिये नहीं रहेगी।

श्री नवल प्रसाद जितनी बिजली दफ्तरों में बिल में खर्च होती है उतनी रात में नहीं होती लेकिन बिजली की मशीन तो बराबर चलती रहती है और उसकी जितनी शक्ति है उतनी बिजली पैदा करती रहेगी। अगर उसका खर्च नहीं होगा तो वह बेकार पड़ी रहेगी और उसमें नुकसान रहेगा। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस तरह का प्रावधान किया जा सके तो किया जाना चाहिए।

यही सुझाव मुझे देने थे। मैं धारा करता हूँ कि उन पर ध्यान दिया जायेगा।

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): The history of this Bill is quite interesting. In the year 1958 Government had appointed an advisory board to propose amendments to the Electricity Act of 1910. The Board submitted its report in the year 1956, and today, in the year 1958, as we are going to close the year, Government are coming forward with this Bill before this House. This is yet another testimony to the slow lethargic unfolding of the proverbial red tape. I wish this kind of lethargy should not have been associated with the concept of energy, power and dynamics. I hope the hon. Minister will kindly take the trouble of acquainting the House with the circumstances under which this inordinate delay has taken place over this simple matter.

At this stage, of course, I do not propose to go into the details of the various provisions of this Bill. We look forward to the fact that the Joint Committee in their wisdom will try to improve many of its provisions which certainly require adequate change. At that stage, we shall be offering our views for what they are worth. But, at this stage, what I do propose is to invite the attention of the Joint Committee as also of this House to some of the provisions which really need reconsideration.

In the first place, the consumers' point of view has been totally ignored. It has been said by no less a person than the Prime Minister of India that we are living today in the age of cow dung. About 90 per cent of our energy requirements are still derived today from cow dung. It is really a pity that while the whole world is awaking to the new possibilities of atomic energy, we still have to depend on cow dung to provide us with the energy requirements. In such a context, Government would have been well advised to consider, while drafting this Bill, how to expand the possibilities of greater consumption not among Government establish-

ments alone but among the people at large.

It pains me to say that Government have been putting a premium on the most unimaginable kind of fleecing of the consumers in regard to the supply of electricity. Let me take the case of the electrical energy which is produced in Hirakud. I do not know if the hon. Minister is aware of it. The Sambalpur Electricity Co., which is a private company, is purchasing electricity at the rate of 10 nP per unit, and it is being sold to the consumers at the rate of 83 nP. Similarly, the Cuttack Electricity Co. which is owned by a foreign concern, the managing agents of which continue to be the Octavia Steel Co Ltd., is also getting electrical energy from the thermal power station at Chowdwar which is fed by the Hirakud electricity grid at the rate of 15 nP, and it is being sold to the consumers in the Cuttack city at the rate of Rs. 0-6-2 or so—I do not know what will be its equivalent in terms of nays paise; it will be about 38 nP or thereabouts. There, you find the enormity of the proposition that the electrical energy which is being produced in State concerns like the Hirakud project is being supplied to these private concerns at a nominal rate, and the consumers are asked to pay this kind of price which bears no ratio whatsoever to the actual cost that they have to pay.

Therefore, my first submission to Joint Committee would be to insert some provision in this Bill to ensure that if at all these private companies are allowed to function in this sector, there should be a reasonable ratio, and there should be a reasonable margin of profit. Otherwise, this kind of price will act as an inhibition against the consumers, and against the expansion of electricity consumption among the consumers. That is my first suggestion.

My second suggestion is in regard to the State Electricity Boards, which feature very prominently in this Bill.

In more than one matter, the State Electricity Board is intimately connected with the functioning of this law. But I would like to know from the hon. Minister how many States are having no State Electricity Boards as yet, and how, in the absence of State Electricity Boards in those States, this law is going to function.

It is true that the State Governments are there, but for very obvious reasons, it was considered necessary to have State Electricity Boards, where the consumers' interests would have to be represented. I do not know what will be the composition of these Boards. According to my information, these Boards will represent the consumers' interests to a very great extent—in the composition of these Boards, there will be consumers' representation also. But if you substitute the State Electricity Boards with government departments, you immediately get the answer. There the consumers have no representation whatsoever. Therefore, the Government in their own wisdom had thought that this should be entrusted to the State Electricity Boards, and in no case whatsoever they can substitute State Electricity Boards with State government departments. I would like to know from the hon. Minister how many States are yet without Electricity Boards and how this law is going to operate in those States in the absence of these Boards. It is quite all right to say that in the absence of these Boards the State Governments will function. But still my objection lingers; the State Governments have not taken the consumers' interests into account; nor are they going to take the consumers' interests in the new set-up.

The third thing is about the compensation that has to be paid to the electricity undertakings under private control. Now, the provision which has been made about the fair market price and the quantum of compensation etc. has thrown open the flood-

Shri Mahanty]

gates of litigation. I am sure this Bill, if enacted in this form, will be a veritable paradise for lawyers from the High Courts to the Supreme Court. What is the concept of a fair market price? Before I come to other considerations, I would like to acquaint this House with one point. When it comes to land, article 31 of the Constitution is amended to the effect that if the Government acquires land in public interest the compensation may be notional; at any rate, it will stand no judicial review. Whatever will be determined by the legislature will be final and binding. But that is not the case here in this Bill. So I would like to ask: why this lop-sided sympathy for the industrialists who are still using outmoded machinery; possibly they have got enough in return out of depreciation charges alone, let alone the profit. We find here that it should be the fair market price. As to how that fair market price will be determined, lengthy provision have been made and if there is any dispute, it will be referred to arbitration.

The Government owe this House an explanation, whether in the present context it is necessary, in framing a legislation of this nature, to bind down the local authorities or State Governments to a position that if they acquire an undertaking which is essential in its nature, fair compensation should have to be paid and that too at the fair market price. I believe the Joint Committee will devote their attention to this aspect of the question and take care to see that the fair market value and its calculation is well simplified; otherwise, it may just be the case that when State Governments or local bodies go to acquire such electricity concerns under private control there will be all kinds of litigations and they will be floundered time and again over clause 7A which provides for compensation.

There is another provision which also needs certain clarification. You will find that the Government may issue directions to those concerns

under the proposed new section 22A. That provides that the Government can direct a licensee to supply power to State concerns or establishments in preference to other consumers. It is true that in certain cases the State stands on a different pedestal of its own from mere mortals like us who are the creators of it. It is true, for instance, that the State enjoys exemptions from certain taxes like income-tax and so on and so forth. But here is a matter which is vital for the very existence of the people themselves. The wording used is 'State establishments'. Had it been 'State undertakings of an industrial character', possibly I would not have opposed that proposition, because State industrial undertakings are, after all, national undertakings, and for that it is well worthwhile, for the people to stand some sacrifice. But 'Government establishments' may mean anything under the sun; it may mean just an office; it may mean even a hotel or a guest house; it may also mean any commercial establishments and so on. Here in this particular case there is no justification whatsoever why State establishments should enjoy preference over normal consumers. I believe this kind of discrimination is rather too odious, and when we want that our consumers should be redeemed from the dim smokiness of the kerosene age, the Government should take care to see that they stand some sacrifice and allow the consumers some kind of amenities.

Therefore, I would once again appeal to the wisdom of the hon. Minister as also to the Joint Committee to take care to see that this kind of discrimination proposed in the directives to be issued under section 22A is removed.

There is another aspect to which we must direct our attention. Our pace of industrialisation is intimately related to the availability of cheap electric energy. It is quite fatuous to suggest that solution of unemployment in India can be facilitated by the

setting up of big steel plants in Rourkela, Bhilai and Durgapur. These gigantic industrial concerns have not much employment potential because they are going to be automatised. For instance, in all these three new plants we are going to have electric furnaces instead of coke oven plants. So the more the pace of this automatisation, the more the number of people who are thrown out of employment. Therefore, it is time to consider how in the countryside, in the villages, small cottage industries grow up and how also these small cottage industries function according to modern techniques. For that, electricity is essential. It pains me to say that even though the Hirakud project has been completed and all its electricity potential ready, still we are not producing the electric energy, for we have no market. It is the Government's view that we have no market. Yet people are thirsting for electricity.

Now, Government should not merely take a legalistic or technical view of this matter. They ought to take an overall view of the subject. They have also to recognise that the destiny of this country is intimately related to the expansion of electric energy not in a few cities but in the countryside. When I scan this Bill in that light, I find no provision whatsoever. I only find that same old bureaucratic attitude of giving preference to government establishments where the babus will possibly plod over some useless papers, where the officers will write their notes under revolving fans while the countryside will go dark and there will be no irrigation facilities where the irrigation facilities could be made available due to the application of electricity. That is denied to them. As I said earlier, we are living in the age of cow dung and it does not reflect well on this administration to allow the rural people wallow in the darkness. They should take a little more dynamic attitude and eschew this kind of an attitude. (It has taken them about

three years to draft a legislation.) If these suggestions are implemented, I believe we have got every reason to look forward.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): I would like to submit that though it has come after 48 years, still this Bill wants to serve some useful purpose. But the principle which we need in our policy is lacking in this amending Bill. Even after independence, the generation and distribution of electricity was governed by the Indian Electricity Act of 1910. It was purely a regulatory and restrictive measure. As the hon. Minister has said in his introductory speech, during the last eleven years, India has made a tremendous progress so far as power is concerned. So far as hydel power is concerned, our progress is commendable. When, after 48 years, we are going to introduce an amending Bill, we must take into consideration the new factors and developments which have come into place in our national and economic life in the last eleven years. There are three or four factors which necessitate a very scientific and reasonable approach to those problems so that we can develop a real national power policy for our country.

In 1955, the private companies owned 45.4 per cent of the public utility installations and 43.7 per cent of the total installed capacity of electricity in this country. During these last eleven years, the Government has been proposing to electrify hundreds of villages and many people in the villages want to avail themselves of this new power for increasing food-grains production. In Madras itself, in 1955, more than 16,000 lift irrigation pumps were operating with the help of electricity and in U.P. more than 3,000 tube wells were operating with electricity. This new factor should be taken into consideration. Electricity is going to the village not only for domestic purposes but for the purpose of increasing food production in the villages. By the supply of electricity, the farmers are enabled to take

[Shri Punigrabi]

course to lift irrigation and tube wells. But this amending Bill does not keep in view this new development.

Secondly, the Government of India has decided, with a view to increase employment opportunities in this country, to disperse the industries that are concentrated in towns and urban areas. If any policy needs to be formulated so far as power is concerned, it must have a rural bias, a bias for industries in the rural areas. We have to see whether this amendment seeks to achieve this thing by affording facilities in the villages for the spread of industries, for providing irrigation facilities to the numerous farmers to increase foodgrains production.

We have also to see whether our power policy will be able to supply electricity at cheap rates to the different villages for industries which need power at cheap rates. The amending Bill lacks in fulfilling these three main objectives.

My hon. friend, Shri Mahanty, also referred to the river valley projects. We are spending more than a hundred crores of rupees every year for executing them. I was looking into the rates of thermal and hydel power, the cost of production and the cost at which it is delivered to the consumers. The maximum cost of production for hydel power in the country is 0.54 annas and the minimum 0.054 annas. As far as thermal power is concerned, the maximum at one place is 5.33 annas and minimum is 1.72 annas. So far as the hydel power is concerned, it works out to 2 or 3 nP and not 10 nP. In Hirakud, we get electricity at the rate of 7 nP per unit. There are these powerhouses which are getting electricity from Hirakud: Cuttack Electricity Company, Sambalpur Electricity Company, Puri Electricity Company. Berhampore and Chatrapur get their supply from Machkund. They are getting their supply at a very low rate but why should they charge from the consumers such high rates? It is 7.50 annas in Orissa. It is different

in Jaipur. It varies from place to place and State to State. In Cuttack it is 7.50 annas; in Jaipur it is 8.4 annas. Somewhere it is at the maximum; somewhere it is at the minimum. In Puri, which gets its electricity from the Hirakud power grid, the consumers pay 2.25 annas and in Bhubaneswar which is at a distance of about 18 miles from Cuttack it comes to about three annas. They are getting the supply at such low rates but they are charging such high rates to the consumers.

So far as the supply of electricity for irrigation purposes is concerned, in Andhra the maximum is 1.50 annas and the minimum is one anna. In Kerala it is the lowest. I do not know how it is but in Kerala for industrial purposes it is only 1.20 annas but in West Bengal it is 6.9 annas for domestic purposes, for industrial purposes it is 4.50 annas. When the Government is spending about a hundred crores of rupees every year for providing cheap electricity in such a large quantity to the people, how is it that these rates are varying so much from place to place? I do not say that there should be a uniform rate, it may not be possible but there must at least be some equality in the ratio of difference prevailing in different States.

So far as the existing electricity supply undertakings are concerned, my hon. friend Shri Mahanty referred to the Octavia Electricity Supply Company. Last Year it made a profit of Rs 3 lakhs, while they are getting electricity at a very cheap rate. If the hon. Minister ever goes on a tour to Cuttack town he will find that every month there is break-down of electricity supply at least four times. Sometimes the important daily newspapers will be published only in the mornings instead of in the evenings because of the failure of electricity for the whole night. For the last so many years this company is going on meretriciously, and the State Government does not dare, I do not know why, to take any

action against this company. It is making a huge profit by getting electricity at 7 to 8 nP. per k.w. and selling it to the consumers at more than six annas. Therefore, this is a thing which needs consideration, but the present amending Bill has not attempted to look to these main objectives so far as the power supply policy of our country is concerned.

Sir, there is a connection between expansion in electricity production and growth of industry. I was looking through the report given on calcium carbide production in this country. They have made a very important suggestion in that report. They have said that the production of calcium carbide involves consumption of a large volume of electricity. About 3500 to 4000 units are required to produce one ton of calcium carbide. Therefore, the cost of power contributes a very important element in the cost of production of calcium carbide. Power rates in the Scandinavian countries and Canada where larger plants have been established for production of calcium carbide are as low as 0.91 pies per k.w., and they have estimated—in India the lowest rate at present is 3.96 pies, prevailing only in Kerala, but the rate for some of the manufacturers like Birla Jute Manufacturing Co. Ltd., is 8 pies per k.w.—that an increase of one pie per k.w. of power involves an increase in expenditure of about Rs. 20 per ton for production of calcium carbide. Therefore, when we are producing electricity, and the plan is that we shall produce it in more quantities, we must take into consideration the question as to how cheaply we can provide electricity for these industries which utilise electricity to a very great extent.

Similarly, in the case of certain industries like electro-chemical and electro-metallurgical industries, they consume more electricity. Therefore, we should see whether any provision can be made whereby some relief can be given to those industries, which consume more electricity for production

purposes. The disadvantage that Indian industries are suffering today from lack of availability of power should also be kept in view when Government proposes to formulate any policy so far as utilisation of power or electrical energy in this country is concerned.

About nationalisation of electrical undertakings my hon. friend Shri Bharucha has put forward his arguments very strongly. I would like to add my arguments also. The country needs to nationalise all public utility electricity undertakings in the country. I do not suggest that they can be taken over overnight or in a month, but the policy should be directed in such a way that there should be progressive nationalisation of almost all the utility electricity undertakings now existing in the country. Take the case of the Calcutta Electricity Supply Company. Last year it made a profit of Rs. 10 lakhs. That is something surprising. They are now getting electricity from the D.V.C. at a very cheap rate. Still they make a profit of Rs. 10 lakhs and they go Scot-free. Therefore, it is necessary that there should be progressive nationalisation of all these electricity undertakings in this country so that ultimately all the electricity undertakings would come under the control of Government.

I have to say a word about operational efficiency. It does not speak well of Government to take over electricity undertakings and go down in efficiency. There is one report with regard to U.P. Government. There it is said that operational efficiency so far as electricity utilisation in U.P. is concerned is going down. It was 24 per cent in 1954-55 whereas it came down to 21 per cent in 1955-56. It has been stated there that even though the Electricity Board undertook an investment of Rs. 70 lakhs for increasing the efficiency, actually it went down by 3 per cent. Therefore, that also needs consideration, when Government proposes to have Electricity Boards in all the States. At present

(Shri Panigrahi)

Electricity Boards are there only in six or seven States. There is no Electricity Board in Orissa. Who will be the authority in charge of utilisation of power in those States where there is no Electricity Board? My hon friend Shri Mahanty has raised that point. The State Government is there to look into it. But the question is, the consumers should be represented when policies with regard to utilisation of our national power resources, utilisation of power to the best advantage of the people are being considered, so that they can look to the interests of the consumers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Sinhasan Singh

Shri Mohammed Imam (Chitaldrug) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does Shri Imam want to speak?

Shri Mohammed Imam: Yes

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have now called Shri Sinhasan Singh, I will call him next.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (गोरखपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जैसा कि श्री महन्ती जी ने बताया है यह विधेयक बहुत देर में आया है। इस विधेयक को लाने से पहले हमने तीन और विधेयक पास किये थे जिन की इनकी आवश्यकता नहीं थी जिनकी कि इस विधेयक की आवश्यकता थी। हमने सिबको के बारे में एक विधेयक पास किया था, फिर माप तौल के बारे में एक विधेयक पास किया था और ये विधेयक ऐसे थे जिन को कि ग्राम लोग आज तक नहीं समझ पावे हैं, आज भी उनको काफी दिक्कत का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। अब उनको किलोमीटर इत्यादि की जानकारी करने में जो दिक्कत पैदा होगी, उसका सामना करना पड़ेगा। इसके पहले इसी सत्र बैठक पर एक कमेटी का गठन थायद १९५३ में हुआ था। अब इस विधेयक के बारे में आप

एक ज्वायट कमेटी बनाने जा रहे हैं। उस कमेटी के विचारार्थ मैं कुछ सुझाव प्रस्तुत करूंगा। इसको पहली पास किया जाना चाहिये था, ऐसा मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

इस विधेयक को देखने से पता चलता है कि आप मूल विधेयक में आमूल परिवर्तन करने जा रहे हैं, पुराने अधिनियम में आमूल-चूल परिवर्तन करने जा रहे हैं। मैं मसझता हूँ कि अच्छा होता अगर उसको खत्म कर दिया जाता और नए रूप से विधेयक लाया जाता। वह पुराने आधार पर बना था, पुरानी बातों को लेकर उसको बनाया गया था। आज हम बिजली के युग में चल रहे हैं। पुराने युग में बिजली कुछ ही लोगों के लिए होती थी या सरकारों के लिए होती थी। ग्राम लोगों को बिजली मिलना बहुत मुश्किल होता था और वह बिल्कुल अप्राप्य हुआ करता था। लेकिन आज गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से हर एक सूबे में कुछ न कुछ बिजली के कारखाने बाँटने के हाइडल हो या अर्बन बन गये हैं और उनको बढ़ाया भी जा रहा है। आज बिजली का काफी प्रयोग भी किया जा रहा है। आज गाँवों में भी बिजली का उपयोग होना शुरू हो गया है और हम चाहते भी हैं कि गाँवों के लोग बिजली से लाभ उठावें वहाँ का व्यवसाय भी बढ़े और वे अधिक प्रभ भो पैदा करें, उनकी खेती बढ़े। हर तरह से बिजली देश का एक महान् अग्र होने जा रही है।

बिजली किस तरह से लोगों को सुलभ हो, इन आर भी गवर्नमेंट का ध्यान गया है। आज जो गवर्नमेंट यह बिल लाई है, उसको इसके लिये धन्यवाद देने हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल के अन्दर वे सुविधायें सुलभ नहीं हैं जो कि सुलभ होनी चाहियें। आज इस बिल में कारखानों के लिए वे सुविधायें सुलभ करने की कोई चेष्टा नहीं की गई है जो उनको सुलभ की जानी चाहियें थी। आज हम रबी आन्दोलन चलाते हैं, खरीफ आन्दोलन चलाते हैं

हैं, अधिक मात्रा उपजाओ आन्दोलनों का शीर्षण करते हैं और साथ ही साथ बिजली भी अधिक मात्रा में पैदा कर रहे हैं। तब यह भी चाहते हैं कि लोग बिजली का उपयोग करें और बिजली को मदद से मिचवाई करें। लेकिन मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज गोरखपुर में बिजली की दर इतनी अधिक है कि जो खेतीहर है वह आपके नलकों में पानी नहीं लेता है चूँकि बिजली की दर बहुत अधिक है। यहाँ पर अभी केरल और उडुसा में जो रेट बताया गया है उसको मुन २२ मूझे हूँगानी हुई। उन लोगों को वही अधिक मान्य पडनी है जबकि हमारे यहाँ उममे कई गुना अधिक है। मैं आपका बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ खेतों के निचे जो बिजली दी जाती थीं दा चार महान पहले उसका दर आठ आना युनित था। मैं आपको अपने अनुभव के आधार पर बतलाना हूँ कि चार एकड धान में एक पानी लेने के लिए मुझे १०१ रुपये का चार्ज देना पड रहा है। अब आप समझ सकते हैं कि इस दर से कौन सा खेतीहर आपकी बिजली में चल रहे नलकों में पानी ले सकता है। चार एकड धान की खेती के लिए पानी लेने के लिए १२१ रुपये देना पडा है। मैं न जब भाव पूछा तो मझ बताया गया कि एक रुपय में ११,००० गैलन पानी देते हैं। इस हिसाब से एक युनित में ५५३३ गैलन पानी हुआ। इस तरह से आठ आना युनित हुआ। इस भाव पर कौन पानी ले सकता है कोई भी नहीं। अब दर कम हुई है और १६,००० गैलन एक रुपये में दिया जायेगा। अब इस १६,००० गैलन को बाटा जाये तो ५५३३ गैलन नलकप से एक युनित बिजली में निकलता है यानी पांच आना या सवा पांच आना फी युनित इटना है। इस दर पर भी लोग नहीं ले सकते हैं। आप यह शिकायत करते हैं कि बिजली का पूरा उपभोग नहीं हो रहा है। अभी पार्सबट्टी साहय ने कहा कि उत्तर प्रदेश में बिजली के उपभोग में कमी हो गई है। यह बात तो स्वतः प्रमाणित है कि उपभोग में कमी हुई है। गोरखपुर में थर्मल प्लांट बना

हुआ है १५,००० किलोवाट का। वहाँ पर चार प्लांट लगे हुए हैं लेकिन उनमें से एक ही अभी तक चल पा रहा है, तीन बन्द पड़े हैं। सरकार की शिकायत है कि कोई बिजली लेने वाला नहीं है, लोगों की शिकायत है कि कोई बिजली देने वाला नहीं है। इन्हीं असमजस में हम पड़े हुए हैं। एक तरफ तो बिजली देने वाला कोई नहीं और दूसरी तरफ बिजली लेने वाला कोई नहीं है। लोग बिजली की माग करते हैं और उनको बिजली नहीं मिलती है। समझ में नहीं आता कि क्या बात है। आज जो बड़े-बड़े खेतीहर हैं वे चाहते हैं कि वे अपने ट्यूबवैल्स को बजाय डीजल इंजिन के बिजली से चलायें, उनको बिजली नहीं मिलती है। उनकी दरखास्तें माली पड़ी रहती हैं, कोई एक्शन नहीं लिया जाता है। गोरखपुर में एक व्यक्ति जोकि देवरिया के वे लखनऊ तक गये कि उनको उनके ट्यूबवैल्स के लिए बिजली दी जाये, नहीं मिली। जब बिजली खेतीहर लोगों के लिए और देशानों में रहने वाले लोगों के लिए लगाई जा रही है या मुहैया की जा रही है तो फिर जब खेतीहर बिजली मागता है और उसको नहीं दी जाती है तो उसका उपभोग कौन करेगा? गावों और कस्बों में लोग बिजली चाहते हैं उनको नहीं मिलती है।

बाकी रही दर की बात। हमारे भाई नौ पैसे और तीन पैसे की शिकायत की है। हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में दर में कमी हो जाने के बाद भी—पूर्वी क्षेत्रों में, जिन के बारे में यह कहा जाता है कि वहाँ अन्न की बड़ी कमी है और जिसकी तरफ हमारी केंद्रीय सरकार का भी ध्यान गया है और हायद वह साठे सात करोड रुपया पूर्वी जिलों के उत्थान के लिए व्यय भी करना चाहती है ताकि वे स्वावलम्बी हो जायें—आज ३६ नये पैसे फी युनित के हिसाब से बिजली दी जाती है जोकि गवर्नमेंट द्वारा जो बिजली दी जाती है उसकी दर है। लेकिन जो प्राइवेट लाइसेंस है, उनके द्वारा जो बिजली दी जाती है उसकी दर

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

नी घाना फी यूनिट है गोरखपुर में। नी घाना फी यूनिट के हिसाब से आप ही बताइये कि कौन बिजली लेगा। सिवाय बड़े-बड़े प्रादमियों के दूसरा कोई भी इस रेट पर बिजली नहीं ले सकता है। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि बिजली होते हुए भी वह खर्च नहीं हो पा रही है। दिल्ली में जहाँ पर कि हम रहते हैं, हम को साढ़े तीन आने फी यूनिट पहले और बिजली के देने पड़ते हैं और जो पावर है उसके लिए हमें केवल डेढ़ घाना फी यूनिट ही देना पड़ता है। इसके मुकाबले में मैंने आपको बतलाया है कि १६,००० गैलन पर साढ़े पाच आने फी यूनिट के हिसाब से हम को वहाँ देना पड़ता है। समझ में नहीं आता है कि यह जो रोग है यह कहा है और इसका क्या इलाज है। मुझे नहीं पता कि इस रोग का इलाज भी किया गया है या नहीं। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि कुछ भी इसका इलाज नहीं किया गया है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि ज्वायंट कमेटी विचार करे कि अगर खेतीहर लोग माग करते हैं कि उनको पानी के लिए बिजली दी जाये तो उनको प्राथमिकता दी जाये। यहाँ पर जो प्राथमिकता दी गई है वह सरकारी दफ्तरों को दी गई है। आज अगर कहीं पर कोई सरकारी दफ्तर खन जाता है तो उसको प्राथमिकता मिलेगी, खेतीहर को नहीं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्राथमिकता के सवाल पर भी कमेटी विचार करे। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि अधिक घन्न पैदा किया जाये और अगर वह बिजली सप्लाई करने से हो सकता है, तो आपको सस्ते भाव पर बिजली देनी होगी। यदि आपने ऐसा किया तो हमारी जो घन्न की आवश्यकता है वह पूरी हो सकेगी या उसको पूरा करने में मदद मिलेगी और आपको बाहर से कम घन्न मंगाना पड़ेगा या बाहर से घन्न मंगा की आवश्यकता ही नहीं रह जायेगी।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मीटरों की खराबी के बारे में यहाँ पर शिकायत की गई है। यहाँ पर कहा गया है कि इन्सुलैटर

जा कर जाँच करने के बाद जब से वह खराबी पैदा हुई हो तब से कुछ कमी बेची कर सकेंगे। इस तरह का कुछ तरीका आज तक रहा है। हमारी शिकायत है कि कम्पनियों द्वारा जो बिजली दी जाती है वहाँ पर इसके लिए पहले दस रुपया जमा कराना पड़ता है और अगर दस रुपया जमा नहीं कराया जाता है तो जो मीटर की खराबी है वह उभी तरह से चलती रहती है और चार्ज बढ़ता रहता है। इस में किसी तरह से कज्यूमर को कोई सुविधा नहीं मिली है। इधर तो कज्यूमर को सुविधा है कि दरखास्त दे, नोटिस दे, इन्सुलैटर आबे, जाच करे। लेकिन कम्पनी को सीधे अगर वह दरखास्त करता है कि हमारा मीटर खराब है आ कर देख लो तो उसको पहले तो दस रुपये जमा कराने पड़ने हैं और अगर खराबी निकल आये तब तो दस रुपये उमको मुजरा दे दिये जाते हैं और अगर खराबी न हो तो जब्द कर लिये जाते हैं। इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि न वह दस रुपये जमा करता है और न जाच होनी है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस पर भी विचार होना चाहिए।

इसमें एक अच्छी बात है। इसमें कहा गया है कि अगर दो प्रादमी बिजली चाहें तो लाइन बन सकती है। पहले छ आदमियों के दरखास्त देने पर यह हो सकता है। रबी आन्दोलन में हम ने देखा है कि उमम भी यह है कि अगर छ आदमी दरखास्त दे ली खाद मिलती है अन्यथा नहीं। अब खाद लेने वाला पहले छ आदमियों की खोज करे तब जा कर खाद की सुविधा से फायदा उठाये और अगर उसको पाच और आदमी नहीं मिलते हैं तो वह इस सुविधा से लाभ नहीं उठा सकता है। इसमें छ की लायाबिलिटी और रिम्पामिबिलिटी साथ होती है। इसी तरह से खेतीहर को जब बिजली की जरूरत होती है तो उसको एक या दो प्रादमी अब खोजने होंगे और उसको बिजली मिल जायेगी अन्यथा नहीं। छ से दो जो किये गये हैं, यह स्वागतयोग्य है। इससे अगर कम हों तो उसके

खर्च पर यह चीज होगी। यह जो किया गया है, यह खुशी की बात है।

मं कमेटी में यह भी अनुरोध करूंगा कि वह देख कि बिजली सस्ते भाव पर कैसे मुलभ की जा सकती है। अब आप हाईड्रॉट से या थर्मल से बिजली पैदा करना चाहते हैं और यह आपको सस्ती भी पडनी है। जब ऐसी बात है तो इसमें महंगे होने का क्या कारण है। आपने जो विभाजन का काम किया हुआ है वह खर्चीला है। एक ही नलकूप पर काम करने के लिए दो अलग अलग इंजीनियर हैं, एक बिजली का और दूसरा पानी का। नलकूप बनाने वाला एक इंजीनियर है और दूसरे काम के लिए दूसरा। बिजली और नलकूप व गूल के अलग एम० डी० ओ० हैं। पेट्रोल दोनों के लिए अलग अलग है। एक ही कुएं पर दो व्यक्ति अलग अलग काम करते हैं। बिजली के अलग एक्जीक्यूटिव इंजीनियर होते हैं और नहर और नलकूप के अलग एक्जीक्यूटिव इंजीनियर होते हैं हालांकि दानों ने इंजीनियरिंग का इम्तिहान पास किया है और उनको कौमेन नीलज है और बिजली का जानकार इंजीनियर नलकूप और गूल को भी बना सकता है। इस तरह में अलग अलग आफिसर्स को न रख कर आप खर्चों को कम कर सकते हैं। और इस तरह आज जा उबल खर्चा होता है वह बन्द किया जा सकता है।

मैं उत्तर प्रदेश की बाबत आपको बताना कि पहले हमारे वहा दा चीफ इंजीनियर्स होते थे जब कि आज ६ चीफ इंजीनियर्स हैं। आज हो यह रहा है कि जा नीचे (एक्चुएन) काम करने वाले कर्मचारी हैं उनकी यह शिकायत है कि हम तो काम करने मरे जान हैं लेकिन हमारी मख्या बढने व बजाय हमारे ऊपर के अफसरगन यानी सुपरवाइजरी स्टाफ की तादाद में बढहोती होती जाती है। जो हमारे कर्मचारी लाइन बनाने वाले हैं उनकी यह शिकायत है कि हम तो लाइन बनाते बनाते मरे जाते हैं और हमारी मख्या जहां १ थी

वहा २ कर दी गई है लेकिन सके विपरीत जो हमारे सुपरवाइजर्स होने हैं इन्स्पेक्टर्स और सुपर इन्स्पेक्टर्स हैं उनकी तादाद बहुत ज्यादा बढा दी गई है और वे इतने अधिक हो गये हैं कि हम उन्ही की ग्रामद वे सिलसिले में देख रख करने में ही रह जाते हैं। और एक्चुएल काम नहीं कर पाते। इसलिए कुछ सुपरवाइजरी स्टाफ में कमी की जानी चाहिए और ऐसा करने से खर्च में कमी होगी। नीचे के कर्मचारियों की जो कि वास्तव में काम करने वाले होते हैं उनकी मख्या आप अलबत्ता बढावें ताकि अधिक काम हो सके।

इसके अनिश्चित मेरा सुझाव यह है कि बिजली और पानी यह दोनों विभाग एक ही मंत्री के अधीन रहने चाहिये। यह बड़े हर्ष की और प्रशंसा की बात है कि उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने पहले पहल इस दिशा में पग उठाया है और अभी वहा पर जो मंत्रिमंडल का पुनर्गठन किया गया है उसमें पावर और डरीगेशन यह दोनों विषय एक ही मंत्री को सौंपे गये हैं। यह बहुत खुशी की बात है कि यहा बन्द में पहले ही पावर एंड डरीगेशन एक मंत्रालय में अधीन है। यह विषय एक ही हाथ में हाने चाहिये क्यो क इन दोनों का आपस में गहरा सम्बन्ध है और सलिए यह दोनों चीजे एक ही मंत्री व पाम रहनी चाहिये।

15 hrs.

इन मुझावों के साथ मैं मयक्त प्रवर समिति में अपील करूंगा कि इस में उचित परिवर्तन करें ताकि लोगों को आमानी से और सही रेट पर और कम कीमत पर बिजली मिल सके।

हमारे गोरखपुर और देवरिया में २७ मिले हैं जिनमें कि हर एक के पास बिजली मौजूद है और अपने अपने क्षेत्र को वह इवन्ग कर सकती थी। मैंने उनके लिए प्रयत्न भी किया और मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हू कि सरिया शहर मिच प्रहर नगर गोरखपुर

[श्री सिद्धान्त सिंह]

वाले पीने दो घाने की यूनिट की दर से बिजली देने को तैयार थे जबकि वही बिजली सरकार अपने यहां साढ़े तीन घाने की यूनिट 40 हिसाब से पैदा करती है लेकिन उनसे बिजली सरकार ने नहीं ली और आज वह 3000 किलोवाट बिजली बेकार पडी है। उसका उपयोग होना चाहिये। जहा कही से हमे बिजली मिल सके या जो हम पैदा कर सकते हो उमका सदुपयोग करे। हमारे गोरखपुर और देवरिया मे ऐसी मिले है जो कि बिजली पैदा करती है और उम बिजली का आप सदुपयोग करे। अच्छी फमल पैदा कर सकते है लेकिन आप उसका फायदा नही उठाते। मुझे मालूम है कि एक मिल ने यह आफर दिया था कि वह डेढ घाने और पीने दो घाने की यूनिट की दर मे बिजली सप्लाय करने का तैयार है लेकिन हमने यह देखा कि उसका फायदा नही उठाया गया और नतीजा यह हुआ कि न तो उमकी बिजली ली गई और न ही गवर्नमेंट की बिजली उस क्षेत्र मे गई जहा कि उमकी जबरत थी और वह क्षेत्र अभी भी अनडिवलपड पडा हुआ है।

मेरा मन्त्री महोदय मे अनुरोध है कि वे हम पर विचार करे और जहा पर बिजली पर्याप्त मात्रा में और सही कीमत पर उपलब्ध हो उसका सदुपयोग करे और उम बिजली को बेकार पडा न रहने दे।

15.02 hrs.

DISCUSSION RE: GANGA BARRAGE PROJECT

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Barrampore): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of Irrigation and Power on the 2nd September, 1958, regarding Ganga Barrage Project, be taken into consideration."

Sir, this statement, as you know, was made during the last session of

the House and it has been before us for the last 2½ months. Even when the statement was made, some of us, not only on this side of the House, but many friends on the other side as well, who have some knowledge of the relevant facts of the matter and also some knowledge of the history and fate of the Ganga Barrage proposal since it was mooted in a concrete project form in 1951-52, felt that we should seek the earliest opportunity to discuss this subject on the floor of this House. It would not have been necessary if we were not already acquainted in the course of the past six years with the surprising procrastination, evasiveness, and indecisiveness, and I might even go to the length of saying, the attitude of hostility, with which the proposal was greeted since it came before the presiding deities of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power in the form of a complete project report.

During the course of the last six years, we have seen three successive Cabinet Ministers and two Chairmen of the Central Water and Power Commission dealing with this matter. A project report based on investigations extending over a period of three years from 1948 to 1951 was before them on which they could take a decision much earlier. But unfortunately, the statement of Janab Ibrahim before us makes no reference to these facts. Indeed if this statement was not presented to this House by so eminent and respectable a gentleman as Janab Ibrahim, I would have no hesitation to call it outright as a dishonest and insincere document. I have yet to come across any official documents which excels this one in the art of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. I will presently prove with such facts and papers that I have in my possession what I mean by this observation. But before that, I must deal with a question that often comes up.

I have often found hon. Members in this House fail to understand and