

[Shri B. K. Das.]

question should be examined for all sections of earning people, I think it should be limited to certain sections. The time has not come when it could be extended to all sorts of earning people. There are people in villages, agriculturists and others, who have got very small earnings. They may not come under the scheme. But it is possible that a certain section of people who have got a certain amount of income may be brought within such a scheme.

An amendment moved by Shri P. R. Chakraverti says that it should be limited to a certain amount of income. Without putting such a limit, if a Committee is appointed, it could go into the matter and examine to what extent a compulsory insurance scheme can be introduced and work out such a scheme. What we find today is that insurance is limited to only the upper class people who have got a certain decent income. It is very seldom that the lower income groups are voluntarily able to save something for insurance. Today if we look into the figures, we find that the average sum assured is Rs. 4,018. This was in 1960. If this is the average insurance, the average premium would come to more than Rs. 200. There are very few people who are able to pay a premium of Rs. 200 per year.

Generally, when insurance is on a voluntary basis, we find that people who have got very high income are approached by the agents.

16 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The field officers try to find out such people as will be able to invest large sums, and be able to take large amounts of insurance. They do not generally go to the poor or low-income group people.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. Member conclude within a minute or two, or would he like to have a longer time?

Shri B. K. Das: I have just begun.

Mr. Speaker: Then he can resume it afterwards.

16.01 hrs.

MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT—
contd.

STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF IRRIGATION
AND POWER RE: BREAKDOWN OF
POWER SUPPLY IN DELHI

Mr. Speaker: Shri A. K. Sen.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I rise on a point of order. My point of order is this, that when we were discussing about the power crisis, the question was raised by my hon. friend Shri Frank Anthony whether this was or not a concurrent subject. If I have heard the Prime Minister correctly, he has owned the responsibility. Should I take it that he did not consult responsible opinion? The point before the House is whether you admit the Adjournment Motion for discussion. Where is the point for the Law Minister to decide it even after the Prime Minister has said so? I want to know whether the Prime Minister consulted the Law Minister or not.

Mr. Speaker: Am I precluded from consulting the Law Minister if I want assistance before coming to a conclusion whether I should allow the adjournment motion or not?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Exactly this is what I am doing. What is the objection?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My objection is only this, that generally if an adjournment motion is allowed, we discuss it from 4 O' Clock. May I take it that if it is allowed after the statement, we will be allowed to discuss not only this but the breakdown and the failure of the Government?

Mr. Speaker: I have said already and I repeat, that before I take a decision and give my consent, I am just consulting the Law Minister.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): Sir, when I raise this point about the Prime Minister's statement that he had owned the responsibility, you were pleased to say that you wanted to consult the Law Minister, and there the matter ends I suppose. I raised this particular point when the Prime Minister categorically acknowledged the responsibility, that the responsibility was that of the Centre for the power crisis and all that, not the power crisis, but for the whole thing, the whole show, and asked if the Law Minister was not to be consulted, and you were pleased to say that you wanted to consult the Law Minister for your guidance. I think the matter ends there.

Mr. Speaker: It should have ended, but now the Member has raised it.

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I did not say the Central Government is responsible for the power crisis.

Mr. Speaker: He has also corrected himself.

Shri Hem Barua: In a moment of exuberance I said like that.

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): Electricity supply is, no doubt, for the purpose of legislation, a subject the Concurrent List, and therefore Parliament is competent to legislate on it. Under the Electricity Supply Act of 1948 the subject of electricity, its generation and supply is covered by a Central legislation. The powers and duties of State Electricity Boards are defined in Chapter IV, section 18 onwards. There is no authority with the Central Government to issue any directions to the State Electricity Boards. Therefore, it would not be competent for the Central Government to issue

directions to the Punjab State Electricity Board. This is exactly what the Minister for Irrigation and Power was saying when he said, if I may quote him, as follows:

"But it is felt that those who are constitutionally responsible for it are not fulfilling their responsibility, but this impression is wrong, and therefore I have to state that this is a matter pertaining to Punjab, and Delhi is not at all concerned with it."

That is what he had in mind. In fact, I may also add that when the committee was going to be appointed to enquire into the failure of the transformers in October, 1961 and July, 1962 the Punjab Government claimed that they were the authority to appoint the committee and they did so, and that committee is still investigating the matter.

The power of giving directions is given to the State Government under section 18(a). So far as Delhi is concerned, supply of electricity in the Union Territory is concerned, that is covered by the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act of 1957, Chapter XIII, section 274 onwards. The primary duty of developing and maintaining an efficient co-ordinated and economical system of electricity supply for the whole of the Union Territory of Delhi is of the Delhi Electricity Supply Committee. The Delhi Electricity Supply Committee is one of the statutory municipal authorities mentioned in section 44 of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act of 1957. Its constitution is defined in section 50. It consists of seven members, of whom four are elected by the Councillors and Aldermen from amongst themselves, and the remaining three are nominated by the Central Government from amongst persons having certain knowledge and experience. It is mentioned in section 50, sub-section (2). The Delhi Corporation has all the powers of a licensee under the Indian Electricity Act of 1910, under section 277 of that Act.

[Shri A. K. Sen]

Under section 278 the Delhi Electricity Supply Committee is given the power to construct or acquire new undertakings for the generation or supply of electricity.

The Delhi Electricity Supply Undertaking is defined in section 2, sub-section (12) of the Act, and means all undertakings vested or acquired or organised, constructed, maintained, extended, managed or conducted by the Corporation for purposes of generating or acquiring supplies of electricity and providing supplies of electricity for licensees etc. Under section 279(1), the General Manager has the primary duty of carrying out repairs, renewals etc., of the Delhi Electricity Supply Undertaking, and has the same powers as the Commissioner under Chapter XII for this purpose.

Under section 281 the Corporation has the power to enter into any agreement with any licensee within the Union Territory of Delhi for the purchase or sale of electricity.

Under section 282—this is very important—no new generating station or extension thereof or replacement of any major unit or plant or works pertaining to the generation of electricity should be undertaken excepting with the permission of the Corporation.

The Delhi Electricity Board constituted under the Electricity Supply Act of 1948 ceased to function as from the date of the establishment of the Corporation which was the 7th April, 1958. So, so far as Delhi is concerned, there is no Delhi State Electricity Board. The functions are vested in the Delhi Electricity Supply Committee and the provisions of the Electricity Supply Act of 1948 relating to State Electricity Boards ceased to apply to the Delhi Union Territory.

So far as the Electricity Undertaking of Delhi area is concerned, the power of the Central Government to act is set out in Chapter XXIV, section 486 onwards. Section 486 deals with the

right of inspection by any officer deputed by the Central Government. Section 487 deals with the powers of the Centre to direct the Corporation or the Electricity Supply Committee or Undertaking to make arrangements to its satisfaction for the proper performance of its duty or making proper financial provisions to its satisfaction for the purpose of its duty. Where the Central Government is of opinion that any duty imposed on any Municipal authority under the Act has not been performed or has been performed in an imperfect, insufficient or unsuitable manner, or that adequate financial provisions have not been made for the purpose of such duty, the Central Government may issue appropriate directions to the Corporation or the authority, and when such directions are issued, all municipal officers concerned must comply with the same. Unless immediate execution of such directions is deemed necessary, the Central Government should give notice to show cause to the municipal authority before issuing such directions.

Under section 487(2), the Central Government has been given power to issue to the three municipal authorities, the Electricity Supply Undertaking, the Transport Undertaking and the Water-Supply and Sewage Disposal Undertaking, directions in relation to the management of these undertakings or in relation to a question of policy concerning any such undertaking—both management and policy—and the municipal authorities concerned must comply with such directions.

Under section 488, the Central Government may itself make arrangements for taking all such action and for meeting all expenses connected therewith from the municipal fund when an action, as directed by the direction aforesaid, is not taken within the time specified. Therefore, the responsibility, on the failure of the Delhi Municipal Electricity Supply Committee or the Delhi Electricity Supply Undertaking to perform its duty or where

these other authorities have performed their duties imperfectly or insufficiently or in an unsuitable manner, is defined in Chapter XXIV of the Delhi Municipal Corporation Act, as stated above. There is no legal or constitutional responsibility, apart from that, as defined in Chapter XXIV.

Under the Allocation of Business by the President, this responsibility is primarily that of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power, excepting that the Home Ministry is to be consulted in the policy matters and all directions are to be issued by the latter.

Sir, this is the position so far as the constitutional and legal responsibility is concerned. No doubt, as Shri Frank Anthony pointed out, it is provided in article 239 of the Constitution, that—

“Save as otherwise provided by Parliament by law, every Union territory shall be administered by the President . . .”

Parliament has provided by law and entrusted the work of generating and supplying electricity to the Delhi area to the Delhi Electricity Supply Undertaking. Only in certain contingencies would action on the part of the Government be justified, namely, where there is a failure to perform the statutory duties or when it performs its duty insufficiently, unsatisfactorily or improperly.

Now, as soon as this crisis took place, a committee was appointed, as I have said and as the hon. Minister for Irrigation and Power had already said. And the Committee was appointed by the Punjab Government which is going into the matter. It is only on disclosure of facts by them that it would be possible to define responsibility for this failure on either the Delhi Electricity Supply Undertaking or the other authorities concerned. And, if such a failure warrants any particular directions to be issued, I have no doubt they will be issued.

In the meantime, the Home Ministry.....

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Has he ascertained from the Home Ministry whether they have issued any directive? (Interruptions)

Shri A. K. Sen: The directive will be issued only after proper facts are ascertained by the enquiry committee.

Shri Nath Pal: Are the facts not known that there is failure.

Shri A. K. Sen: Failure is known; but what direction has to be issued will depend upon the enquiry (Interruptions).

In the meantime, the Home Minister will, no doubt, apprise the House today of the steps which have been taken so far and possibly the formal requirement of direction will not be necessary if the Electricity Supply Undertaking does whatever it is asked to do.

Shri Nath Pal: Tell about the practice; this is all theory. We want to know something about the practice.

Mr. Speaker: So far as I have been able to follow from the statement, the position seems to be this. That as far as the Punjab Electricity Board is concerned, the Centre disowns any responsibility. Further, it says it cannot issue even any directions. This is one part and the Rohtak Road transformer is Punjab's responsibility and their property. So far as that is concerned, the Centre disowns responsibility.

So far as the Delhi Electricity Supply Undertaking is concerned, it is responsible if there has been imperfection, insufficiency or any other unsatisfactory position in the running of that. That, of course, is the responsibility of the Central Government to issue directions. They can issue directions so far as that is concerned . . .

Shri A. K. Sen: Yes; and if the directions are not obeyed, to compel the authorities . . .

Mr. Speaker: So far as the Rohtak Road transformer is concerned, that belongs to the Punjab Government. These adjournment motions also relate to two things—the further breakdown in the other transformer and also at the other place . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Also Rajghat.

Mr. Speaker: Is the other transformer also of Punjab or the Delhi Undertaking.

Shri A. K. Sen: That is of the Delhi Undertaking.

Mr. Speaker: So, that is of the Delhi Electricity Undertaking. We have this much clearly defined. The position of Government, so far as the breakdown of the Rohtak Road transformer is concerned, is that it is not the Central Government's responsibility, nor could it issue any direction.

Shri Nath Pai: It is just to escape and avoid it.

Mr. Speaker: May be. But I am trying to understand from the statement. Of course, so far as the other is concerned, if there was found to be any imperfection or unsatisfactory situation, then, it can issue directions. (Interruptions). I suppose Shri Frank Anthony would like to say something about it.

I may just point out to him that his adjournment motion is about the failure of the Central Government to exercise its authority over the Union territory of Delhi. That is all. It does not refer to Punjab or to anything else. He may speak now.

Shri Dhaon (Lucknow): On a point of information, Sir. I would like to know from the hon. Law Minister whether under the Constitution Delhi vests in the Central Government.

Mr. Speaker: There is no doubt about that.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indian): I do not want to re-canvass the fact that the learned Law Minister, naturally, had to argue his brief with a certain slur. The position as I pin-pointed was with regard to Centre's responsibility and authority with regard to the Electricity Undertaking in the Delhi area. My friend has somewhat euphemized the position so far as the responsibility of the Centre is concerned.

I also discussed sections 487 and 488 of the Delhi Corporation Act with him. While it may be permissible to argue that in the ordinary way it would be the responsibility of the Delhi Electricity Supply Undertaking to do everything that is necessary to ensure the supply of electricity, the point I was trying to make is that when you have an admittedly extraordinary position like this, when you agree that there is breakdown of power, then, the primary responsibility is not of DESU or of the Corporation. At that stage, at any rate, the primary responsibility becomes that of the Central Government. Even when it is running ordinarily, there is an unqualified power to give directives as my friend underlines, both with regard to management and also policy. That is, in the ordinary course, there is unqualified power; but when there is breakdown, this responsibility shifts squarely and completely to the Central Government. That is the point urged. It is not the primary responsibility any more either of the Corporation or of the DESU. As soon as there was breakdown, then, the Government should have immediately assumed all responsibility and all authority in the matter. And, in this they have failed. We do not know....

Mr. Speaker: If the Central Government concedes that it had that responsibility so far as the Delhi Ad-

ministration was concerned, is there anything that we could discuss here?

Shri Frank Anthony: The point is this. We want some information. You concede your responsibility and you are completely supine in the face of this grave question. The question is whether it warrants some kind of a criticism of the Government. Since there was this power break-down, what has the Central Government done specifically to ensure that whatever power we have does not break down, to ensure that whatever power is there, is reinforced. We want to know what steps have been taken.

Mr. Speaker: That is all right. It was indicated, therefore, that the Home Minister would make that statement as to what positive steps have been taken. I am just referring to the adjournment motion. If the responsibility is conceded, is there anything that we can discuss in the adjournment motion?

Shri Frank Anthony: The point would be: how they have discharged that responsibility; merely saying that they are responsible for something, does not do any good.

Mr. Speaker: That is not the question. The question boils down to this. Failure of responsibility is in respect of supply and distribution of electricity in Delhi. That is all right. What was the discussion that took place yesterday? It was: breakdown of supply of electricity. If the same discussion had taken place yesterday, the rule provides, Rule 56, that there cannot be an adjournment motion in the same session.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): In that discussion on behalf of the Government, responsibility was repudiated; after a hell of a lot of trouble, responsibility has been owned by Government. Now, a new situation has arisen. We want a discussion by way of an adjournment motion because the House will not be

satisfied merely with a statement from the Home Minister of what he has done at the 12th hour or even later. But we want to censure the Government for the negligence displayed in the whole proceeding. The whole proceeding has been such, on Government own admission, that things have been done which ought to be censured by the country and by the Parliament.

Shri Hem Barua: May I point out that the rule says that the subject-matter cannot be anticipated when there is a discussion proposed on that.

Mr. Speaker: That is different; that related to the hon. Member's motion at that time; so he remembers that. But the rule says that the motion shall not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session.

Shri Hem Barua: But where a new situation has arisen... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: I may be allowed to say a few words. So far as the Members and the discussion are concerned, the hon. Members knew what they wanted to say. They wanted to censure the Government and discuss the subject. They knew what they wanted to do. They have done it; they have discussed the subject. If Shri Anthony recollects what he has said he will see that he and the other hon. Members who spoke were pinning that responsibility on the Central Government and every word and every adjective that could be used were used. Shri Bagri had used them; Shri Anthony used them, sordid and other words. So, they had done at that time. Then, the hon. Members had not the idea that the Government would not give a complete answer because the reply came later; they did not know that they would disown responsibility. Therefore, so far as the discussion is concerned, the discussion that has already taken place if the hon. Minister's reply was not complete or

[Mr. Speaker]

adequate, that is a different thing altogether. If the Minister had not disowned responsibility but given a sufficient and complete answer, then too the Members cannot give an adjournment motion, because they have said all they wanted to say earlier, before the reply was given. So, so far as I can make out, because the discussion had taken place and hon. Members had taken part in it, there cannot be an adjournment motion on that subject.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You are a good lawyer and on this occasion you may try to change the rule to a certain extent because of the new situation... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I could not do it deliberately. But I can assure him that if I am mistaken and if somebody else can tell me that this rule means something different, I would welcome it. I do not presume that I know everything.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: You are giving a rather logomachic interpretation; I would rather like you to give a creative interpretation in view of what Parliament and the country desire on this subject.

Mr. Speaker: Everyone has not got creative imagination as some hon. Members have... (Interruptions).

Shi S. M. Banerjee: Sir, my adjournment read like this.

Mr. Speaker: I will take that up separately and deal with it later.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) मैं ने भी एक एडजर्नमेंट मोशन दिया है

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह अलग सवाल है, उसे आप इस से मिक्स न करें ।

Shri Frank Anthony: The short point is, if we have to be technically....

Mr. Speaker: The short point is that the Minister should make a statement. There is the consciousness that the Central Government is responsible so far as the imperfect supply or failure is concerned.

Shri Frank Anthony: No, Sir. The only point would be this: failure of the Central Government to exercise authority over the Union Territory. Even if you are pleased to say that that you will not allow a discussion with regard to these facts, the House would at least be entitled to say this, from the position that the Minister himself has taken and admitted, that they have failed to exercise any authority. According to one view, they could not exercise that authority. So that, at least allow us to have this adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: I think in this way we do not come to any conclusion. My difficulty is this. It was a discussion of short duration yesterday. There was no regular motion that could be put; it can only be argued and talked out; there cannot be any other record than the one that has happened. If the hon. Members have a desire to put in any concrete motion, they might do it.... (Interruptions).

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): May I submit that when we discussed the subject yesterday, prior to that there was a failure. That subject has gone out. It has again come up because the failure continues; it is repeated. Therefore, the failure is being brought subsequently for discussion.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: He contradicts himself. If it continues, there cannot be any adjournment motion.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I think an adjournment motion by its very nature involves an amount of censure. What was discussed yesterday was the failure of power in Delhi. Today the adjournment motion specifically says

that it wants to discuss it because it involves a certain amount of censure on the Government or for the Minister concerned.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Sir, the motion today is not in respect of power failure as such but it is in respect of failure of the Central Government to exercise jurisdiction with which it is armed to the extent to which it was required. This adjournment motion actually arises when the discussion ended yesterday when the hon. Minister claimed that he was not responsible or accountable for that. So that the adjournment motion actually arises as a result of the statement of the Irrigation Minister. It begins where the discussion ended yesterday. Therefore, I submit that the rule that has been sought to be applied here ostensibly would not apply to this situation. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have heard enough and this should be the end of this discussion. I give my decision. The failure of the Government in respect of the distribution of electricity was the subject of discussion yesterday; it was amply discussed then. Members had given their views and criticised the Ministry and the Government and said everything they wanted to say. It was only subsequently, only at the end that the Minister had to give his reply. The discussion was of a short duration, under Rule 193. There cannot be any regular motion; there can be no voting on it. Therefore, that has ended.

Now, it is said that this has arisen out of that discussion; because the rule bars that, when the subject is the same, namely, the failure of electricity. Therefore, today, there cannot be any Adjournment Motion. So far as that is concerned, namely, that the Minister was under the impression that the Central Government had no responsibility, the Government has owed that responsibility to a restricted extent, I feel that because the

Minister made that statement under the impression that he had not that responsibility, I would expect—and I am told—that the hon. Home Minister would make a statement on that.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): I wish to make a small submission.

Mr. Speaker: So far as this is concerned, this is concluded.

Shri Priya Gupta: I am making a submission.

Mr. Speaker: Who will conclude it, if he wishes to make a submission and I have said that it is concluded?

Shri Priya Gupta: I would just add to your meaning or interpretation of the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Nothing would end then. Shri Priya Gupta should appreciate that I have said that this is the end of the matter. I heard hon. Members and after that I said so.

Shri Priya Gupta: A small submission may be allowed.

Mr. Speaker: If that is in connection with what I have said, I would not allow. If it is a different thing I will come to it after I hear the hon. Minister.

Shri Priya Gupta: If you hear me now, you may not have the need to give a decision. That is my impression.

Mr. Speaker: Then I think I am glad that before that, I have given my decision.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I say a few words before the hon. Home Minister makes his statement? I am giving really a factual information on this subject and I am not dealing with the Constitution or the law. I am sorry the Minister of Irrigation and Power has not been able to come here because he did not know that this is taking place; he went to Chandigarh last night or this morning and he

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

could not suddenly be transported here; otherwise he would obviously be here. But very soon after this failure took place, he wrote to me that he wanted immediately to appoint a committee to enquire into it. I replied to him that certainly he should do so and take urgent steps in the matter. He had even mentioned certain names, etc. The very next day he wrote to me that when he was at the point of appointing a committee the Punjab Government came in the way and said that they had no objection to the appointment of a committee but they objected to his appointing it because he would then come in the way of their authority. And so he said "I have agreed to it, the appointment of a committee by them, making one or two changes in it; otherwise, the same names were there."

So, the impression in his mind was that because this was confirmed, . . . he could not take action; the Punjab Government came in the way. It is not a legal point that I am saying. Normally, ever since the late G. B. Pant was the Home Minister, he had rightly told him that it was up to him to answer questions but the rest of the matters would be dealt with by the Home Minister—matters in regard to Delhi. So, his impression was created in his mind. It is not a legal or constitutional thing.

Apart from that, the question of exercising any authority arises only when one's advice is not accepted. Then directions can be sent. What I mean to say is, all the time he was much exercised about this failure naturally and he was consulting various people, various authorities, and as the Home Minister will presently say, I suppose, various steps were being taken.

I merely wished to state before the House how the impression arose in his mind, because—it is both—of the late

Home Minister's written directions to him and very lately when he tried to take action the Punjab Government came in the way and said they would take action and he had no authority in which they were concerned.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): May I say a few words before the hon. Home Minister makes his statement? From what I heard from the hon. Prime Minister, it comes to this. On behalf of the Central Government a Committee was going to be appointed. The right of the Central Government to appoint the committee, that authority, was challenged by the Punjab Government. That is the meaning of that action. To that challenge, the Central Government submitted. The result is failure on the part of the Central Government to do its own duty. That is what it comes to.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, I am extremely sorry that there has been some confusion over this important matter, which is exercising the minds of all of us. The responsibility is joint and none of us would like to shirk this responsibility. I might inform the House that my colleague, the Minister of Irrigation and Power, as soon as this situation arose, took up the matter with the engineers of the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking as well as with others, and he had continued discussions with them. In fact, he was very particular that the situation should improve and emergent steps should be taken.

He was told by the engineers that the damage is such that it could not be tackled very soon and the repairs to the transformers, etc. will take some time. In the circumstances, he felt that, because the situation was so bad, naturally the people were suffering and industrial production also was suffering, an enquiry should be held into the matter. As the hon. Prime Minister has just now stated, he proposed a committee for enquiry. It is difficult for me at

this juncture to say as to whose responsibility it is and where the responsibility for this great error or mistake should be fixed. It would certainly be for the technical committee to find out. In fact, no committee of laymen can clearly decide as to where the fault lies. It will have to be considered by experts. May be one or two others may also be there, but it will have to be gone into by expert engineers. So, we will have to wait and when the responsibility is fixed, the matter is so serious that we will have to take necessary action against anyone, whether he is a big officer or small officer; we will have to take some definite and positive action.

As my colleague, the Minister for Irrigation and Power, is not here, I thought that the House may be anxious to know what has been done so far in this connection and I sent for the officers of the Irrigation and Power Ministry and had a discussion with them just now. If you will permit me, Sir, I might tell the House the various steps taken before and specially this morning, in a joint conference of the concerned electrical engineers and the Secretary and other officers of the Irrigation and Power Ministry. I can assure the House that every effort will be made to restore the normal condition and give relief to the people in their present suffering. We will keep the House posted with the improvements made and further steps that are taken. The House will meet again on Monday and I am sure a statement will be made then.

In order to review the position in respect of power supply in Delhi, Shri M. R. Sachdev Secretary, Ministry of Irrigation and Power, visited the Rohtak Road sub-station of the Punjab State Electricity Board on the morning of 8th August, 1962. In the presence of the Chairman, Punjab State Electricity Board, the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, the General Manager, Delhi Electric Supply Under-

taking and other technical officers, he went into the progress of the various measures being taken by the Punjab State Electricity Board for meeting the power supply situation and restoration of normal supply conditions in Delhi. Shri Sachdev emphasised the need for the Punjab State Electricity Board and the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking taking all possible steps immediately to meet the emergency that had arisen. He offered to make available to the Board all such technical and other help that it needed to accomplish this. The Chairman of the Punjab State Electricity Board stated that the work on the installation of the 100 MVA transformers, repairing the 38 MVA damaged transformer and the provision of an alternative arrangement for erecting the 10 MVA transformer brought from Nangal was going on round the clock under the supervision of senior engineers. The position regarding this work was as follows.

For giving additional bulk supply to Delhi, it was necessary to convert the voltage of the Nangal-Delhi transmission line from 132 KV to 220 KV. In this connection, installation of two transformers of 100 MVA each was in progress. After the failure of the 38 MVA transformer on 26th July 1962, the Punjab State Electricity Board were making concerted efforts to expedite the completion of the installation work. The Board hoped to commission one of these transformers by 31st August, 1962. At the instance of Shri Sachdev, the Chairman of the Board agreed that it would be possible by taking simultaneous action at all stages to complete the job by the 20th, but asked that 25th might be fixed as the target date for the purpose.

As regards the 38 MVA transformer, the Board was arranging to repair the transformer which had failed. The damaged limb had been repaired and the components assembled.

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

The 10 MVA transformer arrived at the sub-station from Nangal on the evening of the 7th August. It was being re-assembled. Its oil would have to be dried up before erection. The Chairman, Punjab State Electricity Board agreed to make every effort to commission the transformer by the 15th instant.

Shri Sachdev thereafter discussed the steps being taken by the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking to meet the emergency. He was told by the Corporation authorities that a 300 KW generator which had been taken out for overhaul had been recommissioned after repairs on the 3rd August. Another 1500 KW old plant at Chandrawal station had also been overhauled and pressed into service on the 2nd, but this had not been giving satisfactory service. Another 1000 KW diesel plant which was out for repairs had also been commissioned. One additional 5000 KW plant was expected to be put into service after overhaul by the 9th August.

On the afternoon of 9th August, the Secretary of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power was informed by the General Manager of the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking that the water level of the Yamuna river had fallen suddenly below the normal with the result that the cooling arrangements at the 'A' power station had been adversely affected leading to stoppage of some turbines and reduction of about 11,000 KW generating capacity. Shri Sachdev immediately got into touch with the U. P. Government and arranged for the raising of the level at Okhla to 659.5 in order to ease the situation at the thermal power station. At his request, the U. P. Government further raised it to 659.7 and this level is since then being maintained.

Shri Sachdev, accompanied by his technical experts of the Central Water and Power Commission, discussed this morning at the power house, the steps that were required in order

to restore the conditions to normal. In consultation with them, the following action was taken.

20,000 cusecs of water were released from Tajewala to help ease the situation regarding water supply at the thermal power station. 150 cusecs of water released via the Munik escape at Bhawana. A committee consisting of the Chief Engineer, Central P.W.D., and the Member of the Central Water and Power Commission and the Municipal Engineer was appointed to take all possible steps in order to divert further supplies to the power house from the main river. It was explained to them that all the essential expenditure could be incurred by them in anticipation of formal sanction. One 5,000 KW unit was expected to be commissioned in an hour's time. This has since been commissioned and the Electricity Supply Committee authorities promised to report the difficulties, if any, in the 3,000 KW unit so that immediate steps could be taken to rectify this unit and bring it into commission. The 5,000 KW plant which was to be re-commissioned on the 9th August has also since been commissioned in view of the improvement in the water supply position.

Before I conclude, I might inform the House that a Committee of Technical Experts of the Central Water and Power Commission will assist the Delhi Electric Supply Undertaking in checking up the generating capacities of their diesel units with a view to improving the supply from them. The Ministry of Irrigation and Power promised the DESU all assistance in the matter of locating or import of spare parts needed, if any, for repairing the diesel sets. These are the various steps taken till today morning.

Shri Nath Pai: May I ask a very small question because now he has read out the various measures it becomes very pertinent? May I know at

what stage did the Home Ministry or the Home Minister, as the final authority for ensuring the continuance of normal life in the country, try to get in touch either with the Punjab Government or the Delhi Electric Supply Corporation and whether any effort was made to try to procure a transformer from any other place, having come to the conclusion that it cannot be repaired immediately?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: I am told it was tried to procure it from various places. So far as I am concerned, as soon as I got to know of it that one or two transformers were immediately needed, I got in touch with the Chief Minister of Punjab. He was not available. Then I contacted the Governor and the Governor telephoned to me—in fact, he sent a telegram also in the evening—that the transformer will be released by tomorrow, but it may take two or three days to reach Delhi.

Mr. Speaker: Then I will take up the adjournment motion of Shri Yashpal Singh, as it was the earliest one which I have received. Therefore, I will allow him to ask for the leave of the House to move his adjournment motion.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : मेरी प्रश्न यह है कि कल जो दूसरा जैनरेटर फेल हुआ है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने जो एडजोनमेंट मोशन दिया है, उस के लिये आप लीव आफ दी हाउस मांग सकते हैं। दूसरा जैनरेटर जो फेल हुआ है, उसकी निम्नत .

श्री यशपाल सिंह : कल जो दूसरा जैनरेटर फेल हुआ है, उस के मुताल्लिक मैं ने इजाजत चाही . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप हाउस ने कहा कि आप को इजाजत दी जाये।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : कल सबेरे छः बजे यमुना का पानी कम होना शुरू हो . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप तशरीफ रखिये। आप का मतलब मैं समझ गया हूँ। आप हाउस की लीव अपनी मोशन को मूव करने के लिये चाहते हैं।

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या किसी माननीय सदस्य को इस पर प्रावर्जन है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : जी, हाँ।

Shri Frank Anthony: The motion should be read out to the House. What is the motion?

Shi Nath Pai: May I request you to kindly read it out so that we know what it is?

Mr. Speaker: "Another plant of Delhi power goes out of order and negligence of the Government to check the same."

There are three other similar motions.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : आगे भी जो कुछ इस के नीचे लिखा है, उस को पढ़ दीजिये।

Mr. Speaker: "Reported worsening of power and water crisis in Delhi and subsequently shirking of responsibility by the Central Government".

"Immediate need to discuss the alarming news about another power plant going out of order in Delhi affecting power and water supply."

जो मैम्बर साहिबान लीव दिये जाने के हक में हैं, वे अपनी सीटों में खड़े हो जायें।

(४६ माननीय सदस्य खड़े हुए)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : चूकि रिक्विजिट नंबर आफ मैम्बरज खड़े हुए हैं, इसलिए इजाजत नहीं दी जाती है

Leave is not granted . . . (Interruptions). I am helpless.

Shri Priya Gupta: One hon. Member was left out in counting.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I rise on a point of order. It was announced in

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

the House that the legal interpretation or the constitutional side will be defined by the hon. Law Minister. I know that we were more than 50 Members who were in favour of this motion, but many hon. Members do not know that a vote will be taken at this hour. Therefore I request that the bell should be rung so that hon. Members may know that a vote is being taken.

Mr. Speaker: Is that a ground on which I should postpone it? He had been pressing for it again and again and was interrupting me while I was taking up the other motion, saying that his motion must be taken up. Now when I took that up, he says that he must be given an opportunity to collect other hon. Members.

As leave to move the adjournment motion is not granted, we proceed with the other item.

Shri Nath Pal: Sir, we are not questioning your counting, but I am afraid, some hon. Members were not tall enough to catch your eye. So, may we request you to have a second count?

Mr. Speaker: I have counted them one after another and now, I think, I should be trusted in that. Every time I was rather asking them one by one to sit down after I had counted them. So, I am not going to do it now . . . (Interruption).

श्री प्रिय गणतः मेरे एक तरफ तो प्राय एक-एक लाइन में मेम्बरों का गिन कर बिठलाते गये थे, लेकिन दूसरी तरफ ऐसा नहीं (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Dr. Ranen Sen (Calcutta East): May I ask one question? In the mean time what happens? Do the people continue to suffer like this? What is the position now? As a Member of this House, I am asking this question.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members have many remedies. They should seek those remedies. It is not for me to answer that question.

Dr. Ranen Sen: You are the custodian and guardian of the House. Therefore we want an answer from you.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever is to be regulated here I have to do. Other remedies are known to hon. Members also.

16.53 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: COMPULSORY LIFE INSURANCE—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House shall now resume discussion on the Resolution regarding compulsory life insurance moved by Shri D. C. Sharma.

Shri B. K. Das may continue his speech.

Shri B. K. Das (Contai): Sir, I was submitting that life insurance, as it is today, is confined only to a small number of people. As we find from the figures, in 1960 the number of policies issued was 12,33,638. In a vast country like ours this number is very meagre. Then, as it is today, it has not spread to the countryside.

The work of effecting insurance policies or of having people insured depends largely on the field staff that is appointed by the Life Insurance Corporation. That field staff or the agents who approach people for insurance generally like to approach people who can insure for large sums of money because it is to their advantage. Because of the difficulties of transport going to people who have only small incomes is not paying to them. So long as insurance remains like this, so long as it is done on a voluntary basis, it will be very difficult to confer the benefit of insurance on our people at large. Because, there is no other way—unless some kind of