

Shri Hajarnavis: In the case of U.P., it was formed on 3rd December, 1961, and in the case of the Union Territory of Delhi, it was formed on 1st December, 1961.

Shri R. C. Sharma (Gwalior): What about Madhya Pradesh?

Shri Hajarnavis: As regards Madhya Pradesh, it was formed on 16th December, 1961.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Since the hon. Minister announced yesterday that even the West Bengal Bar Council has been constituted, does he hope to get the All India Bar Council constituted very early?

Shri Hajarnavis: I join the hon. Member in the hope. All that we can do is to hope that it will come into existence immediately.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

13.27 hrs.

AIR CORPORATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Deputy Minister of Civil Aviation (Shri Mohiuddin): On behalf of Dr. P. Subbarayan, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Air Corporations Act, 1953, as passed by the Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The proposed amendment to section 18 of the Air Corporations Act has aroused opposition from some quarters. I hope there is no opposition in this House to this amendment.

It has been alleged that this amendment is a retrograde step, that it will lead to denationalisation of air services and that it is against the

terms of the Industrial Policy Resolution. All possible motives have been attributed to the proposed amendment. I would request hon. Members not to read into the amendment anything more than what is really intended.

I wish to state categorically that Government stand by the Industrial Policy Resolution, and there is no change, not even the slightest shade of an intention to introduce a change, in that policy.

You may recall that on the 5th December, 1961, there was a discussion in this House on the service started between Bombay and Baroda by a non-scheduled operator. During the discussion I had stated that Government had not given specific permission for the operation of the Bombay-Baroda service, as no permission was necessary under the permit issued to the non-scheduled operators. I had also stated that I had no knowledge about it. The hon. Speaker was surprised at that time at my answer that I had no knowledge about it. I had explained that under the licence issued to them, they could start a service between two points not served by the IAC. In November, 1961, there was no service operated by the IAC between Bombay and Baroda. Consequently, under the permit, the private operator could run a non-scheduled service until such time as the IAC stepped into the field. As soon as we decided to run the Bombay-Baroda service ourselves, the private operator had to withdraw.

Questions have also been raised in this House regarding the meaning and significance of the so-called non-scheduled services operated by private operators under a permit granted by the Central Government. Views have been expressed that the frequencies and timings of the non-scheduled services have been such that they can be regarded as scheduled services, thereby impinging the provisions of the Air Corporations Act. It was obvious that if a non-scheduled operator ran about

five or six services a day from, say, Calcutta to some other point, it really throws some doubt in the mind of the people—I have also the same doubt—whether it could be called non-scheduled.

Against the above background, Government reviewed the position and decided to amend section 18 of the Air Corporations Act in the manner proposed in the amending Bill with the sole purpose of putting an end to any doubt or controversy in regard to the operation of such services. By the proposed amendment, Government will have greater control over private operators than under the existing arrangements. For example, once a private operator obtains a non-scheduled service permit under existing rules, he could operate a non-scheduled service between any two points not served by the I.A.C. without approaching the Central Government. In future, however, it will be incumbent on the private operator to obtain a specific permit for each of the sectors over which he desires to operate such a service. In granting such permit, Government may also impose such conditions as would be necessary in order to safeguard the interest of the nationalised Corporations. Indeed, as a result of this amendment, the operation of services by private operators will be brought under more effective and detailed control of Government so that the travelling public will have the benefit of regulated and systematic service between points not served by the nationalised Corporations.

The operation of such private operators will always be without prejudice to the interest of the nationalised Corporations. In this context, the proposed amendment should be welcomed by all who are interested in providing the travelling public efficient, adequate, economic and properly co-ordinated service. The operation of air services by private operators will be confined only to those areas where the nationalised Corporations are not in a position to provide the necessary service. It will be open

to the nationalised Corporations to step into the field as and when it is convenient for them to do so, and the private operator, in terms of the permit granted, shall be obliged to withdraw from the field simultaneously. I would therefore once again assure the House that the proposed amendment shall not in any way operate prejudicially to the implementation of the Industrial Policy Resolution in regard to nationalised air service but will rather facilitate it.

It has been asked: why should not the I.A.C. take over those sectors now operated by private operators? The I.A.C. have given careful thought to this question on more than one occasion and have decided that the best course for them would be to extend their operations progressively, as and when the fleet position permits. The I.A.C. have seriously concerned during the last two years and come to the conclusion that any further extension of the Dakota service would involve them in additional losses. Dakotas, though very good planes, are now difficult to run because spare-parts are not available, and even if available, are available only at very high cost, and so the operation of these planes has become uneconomic. It will be seen that wherever Dakotas are run, the services are uneconomic and there is a loss on that sector. So the I.A.C. do not propose, in spite of the fact that they have some surplus Dakotas, to extend their operations to those areas where the private operators are now operating. It is only on account of the directive given in the Act that the Corporation should act on business principles that they adopted this policy of extending their services only if it is economic, when it does not involve them in losses. That is the important consideration which, I hope, hon. Members will bear in mind.

As far as the I.A.C.'s present position is concerned, they have not got economic, medium-size aircraft to operate in those areas. Under the circumstances, Government have therefore to consider whether to regulate

[Shri Mohiuddin]

the private operators for at least the next three, four or five years till the I.A.C. are in a position to acquire by acquiring economic aircraft to take over those sectors now operated by private operators. I hope during the next three or four years I.A.C. will be able to acquire modern aircraft—turbo prop aircraft—from outside or even the aircraft manufactured in India after due examination of the cost of operation. I hope as soon as they acquire modern aircraft, they will be able to take over the areas which are now operated by private parties.

I hope I have made the points clear as far as amendment to section 18 is concerned and there will now be no misunderstanding about the meaning and import of section 18. I must confess that during my ten years in this Parliament I have not seen any amendment which has provoked such misunderstanding as this amendment has done. Criticisms of the amendment are based absolutely on misunderstanding. I have stated that Government will exercise more control on private operators. I will give an illustration. For example, a non-scheduled operator under his licence can run a service whenever he likes, whenever some passengers are available or whenever some cargo is available. If a private operator is given a licence for scheduled service, it will be incumbent on him, as far as possible, of course under conditions prescribed by Government, to run it as a scheduled service on given times and dates. It will not be possible for him to say that he will run it only when he likes, as it will go against the conditions of the licence. If he has a scheduled service, a scheduled programme, he will have to fly, of course, subject to weather and other technical conditions that may govern the flight. I have just given you one illustration of how greater control will be exercised on the private operators with the amendment that has been proposed in section 18. I therefore suggest that if hon. Members oppose this Bill, they will fully bear this in mind, so that there is no scope for misunderstanding about it.

Now I proceed to the other sections. Under section 30, the Air Transport Council was set up in 1955. This Council was entrusted with the task of studying the general problem of fares and freight rates to be charged by the air services operated by the I.A.C. and to draw up for the consideration of Government a set of principles on the basis of which such fares and freight rates should be determined. Since then, there has been no problem which could be referred to the Council. According to the wording of the section, the Council once established cannot be dissolved. That is the opinion of the Law Ministry. So, this occasion has been taken to amend the section, so that Government has the authority to appoint a Council whenever it is necessary for referring a particular problem to it.

Amendment of section 36 is necessitated by administrative convenience. This section requires the Corporation to prepare and submit estimates to the Central Government not less than three months before the commencement of the financial year. It has been found difficult for the Corporation to submit the estimates three months before the commencement of the financial year. Therefore, it has now been decided that it should be only two months before the commencement of the financial year.

13.42 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

The proposed Sub-section (3) of section 44 is only a formal amendment about rulemaking powers.

Amendment of section 45: The Corporation issue free and concessional passes not only to their own employees, but also to others under certain regulations framed by I.A.T.A. which every scheduled operator is observing. The categories to whom these concessions are usually given are approved booking agents and their representatives, officers and staff of other air

lines on a reciprocal basis and others on grounds of public relations and sales promotion. The name of the Corporation Air India (International) is proposed to be changed to Air India. This is in accordance with the request of the Corporation who have stated that they are better known abroad by the shorter name air India. This does not involve any matter of policy. Such a shorter name is also in line with similar designations used by other international air lines like Air France, Air Lebanon etc. The change in name will be brought into effect by a date to be notified by the Central Government. The rights and obligations of this Corporation will not be affected by the change of name, and this has been provided in the amendment.

With these explanations, I move that the Bill be taken into consideration.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Air Corporations Act, 1953, as passed by the Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta—South West): I regret very much that ven after listening to the hon. Minister, it is not possible for me to welcome or support this Bill.

He began by saying that all sorts of motives had been imputed to this amending Bill, and he appealed to us to consider the real intentions behind it. I am afraid no amending Bill can be judged fairly only on the basis of intentions. Somebody or other has said somewhere, I forget where, that the road to hell is also paved with good intentions. The trouble is we have to see actually what the letter of the amending Bill is, the powers which are being taken, the changes which are being made, and therefore the possibilities which are opened up through the implementation of this Bill.

The usual practice is that extracts are given at the back of the amending

Bill from the parent Act of the relevant sections which are proposed to be amended, but I am rather surprised to find that no relevant extract of this controversial section 18, is regard to which the hon. Minister even went to the extent of saying that in this ten years in Parliament he had never known a clause to arouse so much controversy, has been given at all in the back. The relevant extracts of sections 30, 36, 44 and 45 are given, but nothing is given of section 18. I take it it is due to some mistake or lapse. No motives are going to be imputed here.

Apart from anything else, intentions or otherwise, I am constrained to raise this question again. Whatever the intentions behind it, does or does not this amending Bill constitute a departure from paragraph 8 of the Industrial Policy Resolution? That is what I want to know.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not know why section 18 has not been given there. Probably the reason is that something is being added at the end, and there is no amendment in the section itself.

Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly): There is addition of "or".

Shri Indrajit Gupta: How is one to understand what is relevant or not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: "Or" is to put there, but probably what I said might be the motive or the reason behind that.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: It makes it a bit inconvenient without that.

Shri Hoshiuddin: There was no sinister motive in any case.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I said no sinister motive in any case.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No motive is being imputed, but why should that

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

be left out, that is the question.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: After all, it is circulated for the convenience of Members.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is the practice that all the sections sought to be amended are reproduced at the end. I thought that probably the reason that goaded the man who was responsible for it was that this was only being added at the end. That might be one of the reason.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I was referring to paragraph 8 of the Industrial Policy Resolution which states categorically:

“Railways and air transport, arms and ammunition and atomic energy will, however, be developed as Central Government monopolies.”

The word “however” comes here because before the sentence which I read out it has been stated that in the case of industries listed in Schedule ‘A’ of the Resolution,

“... the expansion of existing privately owned units or the possibility of the State securing the co-operation of private enterprise in the establishment of new units when the national interests so require has been permitted.”

After that it says that railways and air transport, arms and ammunition and atomic energy will, however, be developed as Central Government monopolies. I do not think this is a thing which can be lightly brushed aside now through the means of amending Bills. Here is something which has been discussed and approved, endorsed and passed by this Parliament, or rather the last Parliament, and it is a matter of basic policy, fundamental policy, which I do not think can be tampered with in this way.

Now, let us consider the arguments advanced. The hon. Minister said, for example, that there might be certain areas in the country or certain points which could not be at the moment linked up by the existing corporation due to lack of resources and so on. That may be true, but if one pursues this line of logic and reasoning, this analogy, it can lead us to a very curious position. Here, for the last few days we have been debating and discussing the Railway interim Budget and grants for railways. Demands are constantly made by hon. Members from different parts of the country pressing for construction of new lines in various places, and the reply given by the Railway Ministry has been that they are not in a position at the moment to take up that work.

There are some States— and in fact, it was mentioned here that Kerala is one—where in the while of the Third Five Year Plan there is, at the moment, no project for the construction of any new line because the Railway Ministry say that they are not in a position to do it. Am I to understand that despite this Industrial Policy Resolution, tomorrow if some private company—it may seem absurd, but it is not so absurd because we have had private railway companies in this country, and even now we have some private companies running light railways—if some private company comes forward and says that it is prepared to construct a metre gauge line from such and such a place to such and such a place and run it, because the Railway administration and the Government of India are not in a position to do it, are we going to say that because they are able to do it and we cannot do it, therefore, in this case let an exception be made?

Then, with regard to ammunition. There are plenty of firms, I think, who can, with foreign collaboration, manufacture ammunition. Are we to permit it, if the Government of India is not in a position to undertake the manufacture of any particular category

of ammunition at the moment? This is a kind of reasoning and argument which I am not prepared to accept.

I submit this is a departure from the Industrial Policy Resolution. Whatever the arguments advanced and the intentions may be this is a serious matter. I am very sorry that such a thing has been brought forward at the absolutely fag end of this Parliament. Unfortunately, conditions are such that, perhaps, hardly a handful of Members are there to devote their attention to such a thing. I think it could easily have been held over for another couple of weeks when a new Parliament is going to be constituted and is going to meet. Such an important measure could have been considered by that new Parliament. It can be considered by that Parliament whether it is a departure which could be permitted. Anyway it has been brought forward.

As the hon. Minister said in his opening remarks, some critics have been harassing him with the charge that this means denationalisation. I am sorry I have to repeat that charge. How else will denationalisation be brought about in this country? There is no other means of bringing it about. Nobody can openly come forward and say that they are going to reverse the policy of nationalisation.

Some time ago, you will remember, certain interested quarters in the private sector had started a sort of campaign in this country that certain public sector undertakings, which, according to them, are not running very efficiently, or on business lines or are running at a loss, should be handed over to private enterprise. That question, I think, was raised here and discussed on more than one occasion and we were given a categorical assurance by the Treasury Benches that no such thing was contemplated and it would not be permitted. But, here, I find the thin end of the wedge being brought through this amendment of section 18, because the nation has been led to expect, rightly or wrongly, that with

each successive Five Year Plan, the scope and extent of the public sector or the State sector will be increased and not diminished. They were led to expect that these private operators who are still in the field of air transport will gradually—I am not saying that it must be done overnight, but the tendency has got to be in the direction of taking them over and not allowing the mto stabilise themselves or to expand their activities—be nationalised. If we judge it from that point of view, then, I submit that this section 18—this amendment—really constitutes a breach of faith with what the country has been led to expect.

I do not wish to impute motives though motives could be imputed because at least some of us, who have been following the activities of these private operators in that part of the country I come from, know that their record is certainly not one which can inspire confidence either in their integrity or in their reliability. I think the hon. Minister knows very well how many serious charges and complaints have been brought forward—and some of them have been investigated and found to be correct also, though all were not investigated even—regarding the various malpractices and irregularities which are being carried on by these private operators.

There are big businessmen behind some of them; there are some of our ex-Rajas and Maharajas and feudal princes behind them, who have gone into business. There are some gentlemen—I do not wish to mention their names but everybody knows them—who, certainly, if not patrons, may be quite good friends of the Congress and the ruling party also, who are behind them. I do not wish to say about a particular line in Orissa which you know very well. There people have several times been charged on various counts and the committee of investigation, in some cases, found them guilty of various things, non-compliance with

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

all types of rules and regulations, non-air-worthiness of the craft which they use and so on.

I was surprised that the Minister made a long story about the difficulty of continuing the operation of Dakota aircraft. I agree with him. In respect of the IAC, he says, that the Dakota aircraft, though basically a very good aircraft, cannot be operated efficiently and economically now because of lack of spares and so on. But how is it that the same argument does not apply to these private operators. The vast majority of the air craft they are operating are Dakotas, I am not sure of my figures; may be, they are all Dakotas. I do not know if there are one or two other aircraft somewhere. But, anyway, 99 per cent of their aircraft are Dakotas, the same old type of machines the the IAC wishes with and which the IAC wishes gradually to get rid of. I support that. But how is it that these people are permitted to operate their services with the same Dakotas, may be even kept in worse condition, with the same lack of spares and so on? Complaints have been made that there is risk to lives of passengers involved in such flights. There have also been charges of smuggling and even espionage in the NEFA and other areas.

I do not wish to give the whole story again nor do I wish to mention the names of people involved. It is not as if they have got a record of good public service, integrity and reliability so that we must now come forward and give them, through this Bill, a position which will only help to stabilise their position.

A lot of confusion has been created over this whole business of Scheduled and non-scheduled. What is the difference between scheduled and non-scheduled? I am more confused after listening to the hon. Minister. There is quite a clear definition in the Act, which I may read.

“‘Scheduled air transport service’ means an air transport service undertaken between the same two or more places and operated according to a published time table or with flights so regular or frequent that they constitute a recognisably systematic series, each flight being open to use by members of the public;”

It is very clear and it can relate to both passenger and goods traffic. I would like to know what is the nature of many of these services which have been operated by these operators up to now, because after so many years doubt has arisen in the mind of the Minister. Am I to take it that these things have been done illegally by the Director-General of Civil Aviation? I mean these permits that have given to them. They have been used as normal licences. I do not know whether they publish time tables or not. But I know that in Calcutta these private operators have got their offices, and in prominent places. If anyone goes to their offices and asks for information regarding their flights, he would be given that. We are told about flights between Calcutta and Tripura, between Calcutta and Agartala and Assam etc. all particularly in that direction where the have not got services operated by the Corporation. A huge number of passengers cannot travel across land because Pakistan territory intervenes and they depend on air flights. You can go there and a schedule of flights is handed over to you across the counter. They may not be published in the newspapers, I agree. But any prospective passenger, can enter one of their offices and ask: Have you got flights on that day? Do you run flights on so many days a week? They give it to you. It was nothing so hidden that the Ministry could not find out until now. Permits were going on being issued by the Director General of Civil Aviation. I submit that it is gross irregularity, if

nothing else, which has been committed. What is proposed to be done in practice is that those people are now going to be given an air of respectability or promotion; they are going to be promoted into full scale respectable scheduled operators. I do not think that this something which we can support at all.

14 hrs.

Either they were operating scheduled services or they were not operating. If they were operating scheduled services in practice, the Government is to be held responsible for having permitted them to do something which was illegal. I do not know what is the meaning of non-scheduled services; it is not specifically defined as far as I could find in the Act. One has to define it by inference. Original section 18 is not given unfortunately along with the Bill. There are certain purposes mentioned in that section for which the right of any person is recognised. These are purely *ad hoc* things like carrying passengers for purpose of flying instructions, carrying passengers and goods in rescue or relief operations during any calamity or carrying people for the purpose of joy rides, flight for aerial survey, crop dusting, locust control, etc. Am I to take it up by inference that these are the only things which can be called non-scheduled operations and which are permitted? If that is so then the other things that were being done all this time are neither scheduled flights nor non-scheduled flights. What were they? I do not know.

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): They were licensed.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: They were not licenced. These permits issued are not licences. There is a distinction between the two. *Ad hoc* permits can only be issued for each flight. From flight to flight a new

permit has to be issued. For years together these people were carrying on this practice on the basis of such permits. Therefore, I submit that this is a very dangerous amendment proposed.

The hon. Minister stated that the real effect of this amendment would be that the Government would be able to exercise more effective control. If there are areas which the existing Corporation is not in a position to serve, it is rather to the advantage of the private operators that they be given the status of scheduled operators. What is the harm? He has got his one or two machines or three or four planes. If all this is going to be imposed on him, he must be a proper scheduled operator; he can easily operate on a fixed basis. On so many days in the week the plane will take off at such and such time and land at such and such time. How is it to his disadvantage? I do not understand. That is to his advantage rather than anything else. Several complaints had been made about this thing. He can go whenever he likes; when he does not want to go he need not go but you are not in the picture at all. All that you are going to do now is to enable him to put the thing on a proper regularised footing and run it as a scheduled service. How does he stand to lose?

Secondly, what is meant by saying that they can exercise control? For instance, I ask the Government whether they can fix the fares and freights, fares particularly when you are going to allow somebody under section 18 to operate a scheduled flight, are you in a position to say to him that he must raise the fares? Can they do it? Many of these private operators are able to carry on a propaganda throughout the country that they are able to carry people or freight at lower fares than the nationalised corporations. They do it: they can get away with it. That means that to

[Shri Inderjit Gupta]

that extent people are being benefited. It is stated here that the Government is not able to give the facilities to the public and so these people fill the gap. You must also agree that the advantage they get in terms of fares, etc. must be allowed to continue. If that is done will it be possible at any future date for the Corporation to come in and ask these gentlemen to retire? The trend with the Corporation is that there is an upward revision of fares and freights all the time because they say that they are running at a loss and they need bigger revenues and all that. These people are under-cutting all the time. Once you allow them to come in as scheduled concerns with lower freights and fares in the interest of the public, with what justification are you in future going to intervene again and force them to retire simply because you have been able to secure a few extra planes? It will be very difficult. How will the nationalised sector stand up and face the people? I do not know. It will in fact enable those people to discredit the public sector more. Therefore, I am wholly opposed to this section 18. It is a very dangerous thing.

I have to refer to my suspicion again. I can understand and appreciate why the amending Bill has produced so much controversy though the Minister said that this is an innocent clause. There is the power to dissolve the Air Transport Council. I have not been long in this House and I do not know how many times the Governments has come forward of its own volition before the Parliament saying that because a particular council or committee has got no work it should be dissolved. I do not know whether I should welcome it from one point of view. Some suspicion arises in my mind. After all this Air Transport Council is an advisory body; it has not got executive or administrative functions. The functions and the duties of this council have been partially disclosed just now by the hon. Minister.

He referred only to that particular function which says that at the request of the Central Government the members of that Council shall investigate any matter relating to the fares and freight rates or other charges levied by every Corporation, etc. And he said that on this subject there was nothing at the moment which required the attention of that Council. I find from section 31 of the original Act that it is not the only function. There are other functions which he has not mentioned. It says that it shall be the duty of the Council to consider at the request of either of the Corporations—Air India or the Indian Airlines Corporation—any matter of the kind referred to in section 38. Now, Sir, I shall have to trouble you and take you to section 38 which says that it shall be the duty of each of the Corporations to enter into consultations with the other in matters of common interest to the two Corporations including in particular the operation of scheduled air transport services and the routes on which such services shall be operated by each of the Corporations, frequency of the services, passenger fares and freight rates to be charged, measures of economy to be taken, provision of common services in regard to overall maintenance and so on and so forth. In all these matters, either of these corporations or both the corporations can refer any matter to the Air Transport Council for its consideration, its advice or its recommendations. How does the question arise, namely, that there is no work for them to do? This is a facility which has been provided to the corporations. It is an advisory body to which these corporations or either of these corporations, if they feel it necessary, can take any of these very important matters. That is the function of the advisory body.

Shri Mohiuddin: We did ask them whether they had any problem for reference to the Council and they said no.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: They may not have one at this particular moment. The Act says that whenever necessary, they can do it. Any matter can be referred to it.

Shri Mohiuddin: Instead of keeping it as a standing body, whenever problems, are referred to, we will appoint a body.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Why this sudden concern? I cannot understand it. The duties of the Council are, they shall tender advice to the Government, and make financial and economic analysis and maintain the costs and have statistical technicians and make financial reporting relating to the air transport, etc. Therefore, I think this is just the time when a host of new problems will arise, when section 18 is implemented. This is the time when the private operators, will have problems, and this is the time when you are conferring on them the status of scheduled operators, and when the whole question of freight and fares and maintenance and overhauling will come up. You will then require some advice, but then, just at this moment, you decide that the Air Transport Council must be dissolved. I am baffled; I cannot understand it. What is there behind it? You do not want even advice from the Air Transport Council which you yourself constituted. It is not somebody else's body. It has got various interests on it—people who can spend a little time and devote some attention to particular, specific matters which are brought to it, with some sort of specialisation. Therefore, these two things taken together have certainly created a lot of disquiet in my mind, and I am firmly opposed to this proposed amendment of both sections—sections 18 and 30. I think the House should not support it.

We stand in support of the Industrial Policy Resolution, and we think

that should not be lightly brushed aside by saying that "we are not departing one iota from that resolution and we are bringing forward this amending Bill." I say that it is a departure, and this amendment should not be supported. Otherwise, the thin end of the wedge will come in like this in one sector after another.

With these words, I oppose the amendment and I hope the House will not give its approval to it.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have heard with great attention the speech of the hon. Member opposite. In the first place, he seems to labour under the impression that there is something terrible that is happening and that Government wants to hide something, that it is not placing all the cards on the table. A lot of imputations and motives have also been noticed in his speech.

I should like to point out that Government are bringing forward this Bill evidently for a specific purpose so that they can have themselves some control on those operators that are plying. The operators have only to come for a permit and they can ply with the possession of the permit. Now, they will come in, but more stringent control will be kept on them. For every route on which they want to function, they will have to get the permission, and conditions will be put down about the maintenance of the aircraft etc. In fact, I should not wonder when some of the operators who do not satisfy or will not be able to satisfy these conditions will even drop out of the picture!

Shri Indrajit Gupta: They can continue to operate as non-scheduled operators.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: After this amendment, I do not think they will be allowed to do so.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: They will be,

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: Control will be there and they will have to get the permission.

Secondly, the hon. Member also draws an analogy between what the railways were able to put up, and why places could not be connected by sea-routes, and why other people should step in here. I would like to point out that rail lines need much more preparation; to make new lines, you will have to have roads, tracks and many other things. After all, to go by air, from one place to another, it does not need so much preparation. That is common sense. If a private person cannot put up a rail line, the private operator may with greater ease fly from one point to another. The private operators thus meet a legitimate want of the public, because there are places where the IAC is not able to function, and the public want to travel. There are places that are entirely inaccessible. So, these private operators can serve and satisfy a need which is very acutely felt at the moment.

After all, the private person has been called in to supplement some of the things that the State-owned sector has not been able to do. In fact, I may quote the Railway Minister as having said that some of the stations are being given to contractors because the railway feels that if they are given to contractors, they can have a better check over ticketless travel. So, it is not as if the private sector and the public sector are at loggerheads. The one complements the other. That should be the attitude of the Government and I think that is the attitude that the Government have shown even in the Industrial Policy Resolution.

Much has been said against the private operator: Sir, that he has done so many bad things and that he has never done anything good. I may say that the private operators during their tenure have done quite a bit of service to India and the public sector. They may have had lapses and may have lost planes, but after all, losing a plane or meeting with an accident is not in the hands of any pilot or anybody that may be there. There are many factors.

Even the IAC or IAF have lost planes. That in itself is not a hindrance in the way of any private operator operating a route. The private operators have operated in supply droppings in the Mizo hills, when the district was faced with starvation, and had it not been for the private operators, many people would have died.

They have also done the same in Manipur under the same conditions, namely, starvation conditions. They have dropped supplies in Orissa during the flood devastations. There have been mercy flights during the language riots in Assam. Private operators have done that at the risk of their lives to save the people. It is not that they give only joy rides or that they try to make profits out of the lives of the people and cargo they carry. They also undertake missions of mercy. In fact, the hon. Deputy Minister of External Affairs, when she wanted to visit the Naga Hills and the NEFA area, could not be flown by the IAC or the IAF. It was one of the private operators who took her there for her tour of these areas.

Then again, they have opened up a west African route to Ghana and Nigeria. The argument was put forward that once they put up or open up a route, it will be a loss for the Government and the IAC would never be able to step in. But I may point out that the private operators, time and again, have developed routes and made profits and paid huge amounts by way of income-tax and corporation tax. But those routes which have been directly developed by them have been taken over by the IAC. The IAC are operating them. After the spadework of the private operators, the Government have come in. Then, the private operators are one of the most popular carriers of tea. They have opened route after route in the eastern zone. They have kept a cheap and efficient air service between Calcutta and North Bihar and Assam, and they have opened up air-fields in the remotest parts of Assam where nobody could have gone. Nobody could have gone there but for the private operators.

What is this thing against the private operators? If you really look at their performance, it is not that bad. Look at the maximum tonnage dropped by the IAC in one month; it is 1,000 tons. The maximum tonnage dropped by private operators is 1,860 tons. The minimum tonnage in any month has been 400 for the IAC, whereas the minimum tonnage for the private operator is never lower than 600 tons.

Of course, a scheduled operator, owing to top-heaviness must function in a certain way—I mean any Government undertaking—entails more care, more expense, etc., which is all to the good. But it is wrong to imagine that the private operators operating a plane necessarily take more risks. That is not so. The private operator possibly works harder and thus makes profits. He has eight to ten sorties in a day whereas the IAC would only have three to four. That would enable them to make profits and serve the public in a way that Government corporations could not.

Some people are under a wrong impression that that there is something sinister going to happen. We have adopted a mixed economy and in other countries also non-State or private operators are very much in evidence. In the U.S., all airlines are privately-owned, while in countries like Britain, France and Australia, both State-owned as well as independent private operators exist. So, it is nothing so very sinister which is sought to be done in India by modifying this clause. I certainly think that this is a good step we are taking, because by and large, if they could not be so well-controlled before, now I think they will be controlled and there will be a certain amount of stability.

Because you are a private enterprise willing to run a private air service, it does not mean that you are a black sheep and you should not have any support from Government when you can do work and really serve the public. I do not see why that should be so. They are also citizens of India

free to do what they can to serve the people. Why should there be this idea that they have been given a promotion, as the hon. Member says? They have been given a certain field to work, in which they will have to work under certain conditions and rules, which they will have to observe. It is all very good and I certainly support this amendment.

There is one point about the Air Transport Council that is going to be done away with which I would like to bring to the notice of the Government. It cost the Government, as it says in the Financial Memorandum, Rs. 80,000. The Government can constitute it and reconstitute it as it needs, but when it envisages the time when it will have to reconstitute it for various reasons, in that case, I should think the people in the country and the air services, private and State-owned, will be more stable and the work will go on in a more orderly manner if we could have an Air Transport Licensing Board. We have similar boards for shipping and railways. Why not have it for air transport also? I think it is a body that should be there, ready to function whenever it may be necessary.

In his speech in the Rajya Sabha the hon. Minister stressed the point that as and when they could, the IAC would be ready to take up the routes opened by the private air operators. In itself, I have nothing against that, but still if one works under this condition that at any time one can be just snapped out of the field, naturally there is not that state of equilibrium and good working of the service that one would wish. I think they should be given a reasonable time over which they could build up the service, arrange for spare parts, keep their machines in order and so on, so that no safety margin is in any way lost. If there is the fear always that I can be snapped out on the least pretext, say, within a month, I will not spend that much money which I would if I had a certain feeling that there would be some time allowed to me to operate to equip the service fully and

[Shrimati Ua Palchoudhury]

get a modicum of return on the money that I have put in; which is expected in any business. After all; the Minister himself said that the Government corporations like the IAC must be run on business lines. This is very good. Even the State-owned concerns must run on business lines. That business outlook should be there.

The private operator should be made to feel that he is there to serve the needs of the country; because there are people all over the country not necessarily air-minded as such; but who if fares are low; could get to various points much faster. Business is increasing and various routes are opening out. Employment opportunities are there and people want to get to places quickly. That only persons neatly dressed and with very good luggage travel by air is no longer true of India, because you find every kind of person travelling by air. That is, as it should be in a people's democracy, where air services are not only for the rich, but also for the middle-class and the poorer person. So, if the fares are lower than in the scheduled Government routes, that should be an advantage, to be approved, and not condemned as "under cutting".

Our young men are very well-trained, and they fly with a certain feeling of adventure, because flying even today is to a certain extent an adventure. I think our young men, coupled with enterprise and a will to succeed, will sit in the cockpit with adventure and carry on air transport in India to achieve a standard in front of the world, where everybody will admire not only the IAC and Air India, as the Air India International is going to be called henceforth, but the private operators also, who will have built for themselves a tradition, which will be valued and respected all over the world.

Sir, I warmly welcome this Bill.

Shri Bal Raj Badhok (New Delhi):

Sir, I and the party I represent are no protagonists for nationalisation. In fact,

we have been opposing indiscriminate extension of the public sector and the strangulation of private enterprise. Even then, there are certain activities, certain branches of industry, which we feel are so important for the national life that they should be under public ownership. That is why we have been supporting the public ownership of the railways, airlines, telegraphs and the new steel mills that are coming up.

There were so many private companies running the railways and they were running them well, but we took them over because we thought in the wider interest of the nation, that railways in the whole country should be under one State control. The same is true of the airlines. When the Airlines Corporation was formed and all private airlines were taken over by the Government, we welcomed it. During the last few years, the Airlines Corporation has been running the air service inside and outside the country quite efficiently. There have been accidents and criticism; there are bound to be. But because of its strategic importance, because it is an industry which employs pilots who are needed not only in peace time, but whose importance and utility in days of stress, struggle and war become all the more important, we feel that there should be one organisation which should systematically train and provide employment to pilots, and also provide air services in all nooks and corners of the country.

Even though there was a particular resolution by which a sort of State monopoly was established when the Airlines Corporation was formed, still certain private operators were allowed to continue. There have been some complaints against them, but they were doing some job as non-scheduled operators. Now by the amendment that is going to be made, these private operators are going to be regularised. They are being given a new respectability and a departure is being made from the policy that was being followed all these years. If this departure is made after realisation that the policy

of nationalisation has failed; one could have understood it. But; in this case; a departure is being made; not because of the realisation of any kind of failure in that policy, but because certain individuals or airlines need to be accommodated, and there it is that the rub, comes.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri stated just now that competition is good for consumers. I agree. Wherever there is healthy competition between State enterprise and private enterprise, State operators and private operators, efficiently will increase, the consumer will gain and the traveller will gain. But are we following that principle?

Here in the city of Delhi we have a terrible transport problem. There are not enough buses and a demand has been made, both in the Municipal Corporation and outside, that till you have enough buses you should allow private operators to run certain routes. When the matter came up in the Corporation, it was opposed and shelter was taken under the same resolution which was just now referred to. They said that transport must be State controlled and it would be against socialism to allow private operators to run any route. Then no care was taken of the interests of the people. The people of Delhi have to waste hours and hours in standing in queues and they do not get a bus. The private operators are available and are willing to run the buses, but they are not given routes.

Just now it has been stated that private railways could not be allowed to be opened because they need tracks, and for running private airlines we do not need a track. But we do require dakotas, we do require planes which would cost much more than an ordinary bus. Then, for running private buses you do not require new roads, as the roads are already there. So, why do you not pursue the same policy in the case of road transport also? It is the double standard which

is visible in the policy of this Government in almost all matters—they have one standard for their own men, one standard for their own conduct, one standard to judge their own policies and another standard to judge other people and their policies—it is this double standard which is at the root of all troubles.

So, what I mean to say is that you cannot justify private air operators and, at the same time, denounce private bus operators. You must have a change. You may decide, and decide after full consideration, but the policy that we have been following need a change. I feel that some kind of re-thinking is already going on. The Prime Minister in his address to the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry stated that mixed economy is a very welcome thing. But that goes against the slogan of socialism that has been going on in this country and on the basis of which it is said that congress has won these elections. Therefore, let us be honest to ourselves, let us be honest to the people. If we really feel that mixed economy is good, if we really feel that competition between the private operator and the State operator, between private enterprise and State enterprise is good for the country, good for efficiency, good for the consumer, then accept it as a State policy. But to accept something as a State policy and then do something in the case of such a strategic industry as civil aviation simply because somebody has to be accommodated is not good. I do not want to impute motives here, but the fact remains that the matter came up in this House about the Kainga Airlines, there was heated discussion and the person who owns major shares in that organisation, to accommodate whom this amendment has been brought in, is a person who has condemned mixed economy as an unmixed evil. The same person wants that there should be private operators in the case of air transport. This is wrong.

Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri: There is a merchant navy.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok: That is true. But here I am referring to this particular Bill. Generally, I for one would like competition in all industries, but in the case of air services, as things are, they are in a developing stage. Ours is a vast country and the dangers that we are facing, especially external air aggression, are very great and a very large force of trained pilots and aeroplanes are needed if, God forbid, some war comes or something else happens and, therefore; for that reason, more than anything else, I for one stand for complete State control over all kinds of airlines. Therefore, this policy of allowing any private operators to run their services, whether scheduled or non-scheduled, to my mind would be detrimental to the efficiency and proper development of the civil aviation and the training of the employees and pilots in civil aviation. This has been proved by some of the unhealthy practices that have come to light. Because of the high freight charges that are being charged by the State controlled airlines—I am opposed to that; in fact, air transport has been made more and more costly, and that is not warranted by facts. Because of the monopoly, Government should not go on raising the fares. That is not correct. So the private operators run certain non-scheduled flights and they do certain things which are objectionable and which have created some kind of racket. We should try to remove that, and for that the right method is not the one which is at present adopted. This kind of method can only further aggravate the situation in that respect, particularly because the employees of the Air Corporations feel that by allowing these private operations to run their service, conditions will be created which will adversely affect them. If in an important service like the air service the employees are not contented, they are not satisfied in fact the employees as a whole are opposed to

this move if they do not like the move for valid reasons that may affect the efficiency of the entire air services of the country. Therefore, for that reason, I am opposed to the proposed amendedment to section 18 and I would request the Government to stick to its old policy and have all the airlines, both external and internal under their own control.

Of course, there are some other amendments which are not so important, like the change in the name of the Corporation etc. They are minor things. I think a small name is welcome and I have no opposition to that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Pali): My hon. friend who just now spoke referred to the concept of mixed economy. I think the policy of the Congress Government has been quite clear on this subject. We have accepted mixed economy, the Prime Minister only the other day emphasised that mixed economy is our accepted policy, and mixed economy is positive concept: So, no further clarification is necessary on this point. When we talk of mixed economy, we have before us the Industrial Policy Resolution to which my hon. friend from the Communist party referred to. May be, it is true that we are not violating the letter of this policy Resolution, but I am quite clear in my mind that we are definitely offending against the spirit of that Resolution.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: You are violating the letter also.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: That Resolution is open to that interpretation. There is a saving clause which will permit this sort of private enterprise being given a place. This has been possibly the explanation given on the floor of this House more than once when this particular matter has come up for discussion. But even if such an explanation is possible and the policy Resolution is

open to that interpretation, I do submit that it does offend against the spirit of that Resolution. Also, it does offend against our recent resolve that we must give effective implementation to our socialistic ideas. We have not to be stationary but we have got to go ahead. We have to be progressive and to be more effective in bringing about the social objectives in a socialistic society. If that is our avowed intention and if that is the policy of the programme which we have given to the country, a heavy responsibility rests on the shoulders of anybody sitting here to give it a positive meaning also.

During this week I had occasions when I had to speak against the private sector in the strongest possible terms. But I might again submit that I am not allergic to the private sector. Yet, I cannot too strongly object to the provisions of this Bill not only because of this policy Resolution which is before us but also because of other practical reasons to which I would like to have a clear answer from my hon. friend, the Deputy Minister. I would like to ask him a straight question.

Apart from the policy and the philosophy of the whole thing, I would like to ask about the economics of the thing. I would like to know how it is possible for any private enterprise to run a particular route if it is not profitable. How will they be able to do it? If it is profitable, how is it that the Corporation is not in a position to take up that route? If it is profitable, there is no reason why the Corporation should not be able to take it. If it is not profitable, no private enterprise will ever go into it. The private enterprise, I am told, has been going into it because they have been resorting to malpractices. Then do I understand that we want to abet those malpractices? If we do not want the private sector to resort to those malpractices, how are the private enterprises going to take any licence and run these services if we are going to be effective?

I would also like my hon. friend to answer me on another point. Only this morning he told us that they are making huge profits on the trunk routes. If the Corporation is making huge profits on the trunk routes, is it not the moral and social obligation of the Corporation to run all these services? They want to take and run the trunk routes where they are making huge profits and want the private operator to come and run some of these routes where they think that no profit is possible. To me it appears to be an absolutely understandable proposition. It is definitely the moral and social obligation of the Corporation to see that they open up the country and put before their Parliament a proper scheme for their air routes and air transport, get the entire scheme approved by this Parliament and take over some of these unremunerative routes also.

I am just giving out the difficulties which, I feel, are inherent in the proposition. I also feel that there would be another difficulty. The Corporation would be under political pressures. They would be under a political pressure to say, "We are not in a position to run this particular flight. This may be given to a private enterprise." They will definitely be under political pressures. If those routes are profitable according to the private enterprise." They will definitely, be under political pressures. If those routes are profitable according to the private operators in their own way, though I have not been able to understand and appreciate how these routes can be profitable until and unless they resort to malpractices, why can the Corporation which has got all the technical know-how, the personnel and the experience not run it?

If the private operator who has got to have certain heavy overheads and employ certain people for one flight will be able to run it, I think it raises another very fundamental question before us. That will have to be accepted. This means that there is inefficiency inherent in the public sec-

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

tor. We will have to accept that if we go from argument to argument and if we feel justified in bringing in the private sector for these flights on such routes. It appears to me that there is something fundamentally wrong about the way in which our public sector is running. This definitely means that there is some inherent inefficiency in the public sector. I think it is too serious a matter to be dealt with in a light manner. I do not for one moment feel called upon to subscribe to the views which have been expressed. It offends the spirit of the policy Resolution. That I am quite clear in my mind. I do not see there is any social and practical justification for the proposal. It will never work if we are honest about it. We will be open to the charge that we are abetting malpractices. It will also open room for political pressures and the Corporation and the Government will be failing in their social duty. They are making money on trunk routes but are not prepared to take these unremunerative routes and open up the country. That, has been our charge against this Corporation. They must run on commercial lines. That is absolutely understood. But when they run on commercial lines it is also a concept which has been accepted by all public enterprises that they have got to work in the larger interest of the society. They have got to open up the areas and have got to take along with the remunerative lines unremunerative lines also which in the long run may also become remunerative. They are going in a very shy manner in this matter. I hope, therefore, that my hon. friend, when he answers will satisfy this House about the philosophy, the socialism and the economics of this.

I have just one word to say about the change of name which they propose for Air India International. Obviously, there should be no objection if we say that it should be termed as Air India. My hon. friend says that

we have got Air France, Air Swiss and all that. But there is one difference. We have got two separate services. Air France is not prohibited to run in France for their local service. Here if Air India is the name, there would be a little confusion in the country itself. I think it is now time that we have just one Corporation and we have an amalgamation of the two. It will mean for far greater economy. Then and then alone, the name Air India would be perfectly justified, Air India which will operate in this country as well as outside. But, still, if, for any good reasons, we want to change the name, I have no fundamental objection to making this name a little shorter. But, there is a basic difference between the other services and the service here and in the local circumstances in our country. That should also be borne in mind when a final decision is taken.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो संशोधन है वह विवादास्पद है और तब से मुझे और भी आश्चर्य हुआ जब से मैंने श्री मधोक के कथन को सुना है। वे मिक्स्ड एकानमी को सपोर्ट भी करते हैं और आपस में मुकाबला भी चाहते हैं। गवर्नमेंट के कारखानों और प्राइवेट कारखानों का मुकाबला भी चाहते हैं। लेकिन तब भी उनके विचारानुसार इसके अन्दर कोई बात है जिसके कारण वे इसका विरोध करते हैं।

श्री बलराज मधोक : मैं एयरलाइन्स और रेलवेज दोनों का राष्ट्रीयकरण चाहता हूँ।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : इसके लिए आपने कहा है कि इसमें कोई खास व्यक्ति का किसी कारण से लाभ दीखता है इसलिये आप इसके विरुद्ध हैं। गवर्नमेंट की जो मिश्रित अर्थनीति या मिक्स्ड एकानमी है मैं उसका प्रतिपादक नहीं हूँ और एक तरह से विरोध

ही करता हूँ क्योंकि दोनों साथ साथ नहीं चल सकते। जहाँ दोनों साथ साथ चलते हैं वहाँ पर जो व्यक्तिगत क्षेत्र या निजी क्षेत्र है वह सरकारी क्षेत्र को परास्त ही करता है और आगे भी करेगा। लेकिन शुरू से ही हमारी मिक्स्ड एकानमी हर तरह से चल रही है। रेलवे आज बिल्कुल सरकारी क्षेत्र है वहाँ भी थोड़ी थोड़ी छोटी लाइन्स हैं जो कि प्राइवेट क्षेत्र में हैं। शायद शहादरा में भी प्राइवेट लाइन ही चलती है। रेलवे का भी पूरा राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं हुआ है छोटी छोटी लाइनें चलती हैं निजी रूप से। इसी तरह से आइरन ऐंड स्टील है वहाँ भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर चलता है, लोहा और कोयला की खानें हैं, वहाँ भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर चलता है। वैसे ही शिपिंग है, वहाँ भी प्राइवेट सेक्टर चलता है। अभी २२ करोड़ रुपये के लेन देन का जयन्ती कम्पनी का हल्ला उठ चुका है कि यह दिया जाय या न दिया जाय। शिपिंग भी वैसे ही है जहाँ पर प्राइवेट सेक्टर चल रहा है। हर ट्रांसपोर्ट में इसी तरह हो रहा है। सड़क ट्रांसपोर्ट में प्राइवेट सेक्टर भी है और पब्लिक सेक्टर भी है दिल्ली की बात छोड़ दीजिये। दिल्ली में जिस क्षेत्र को सरकार लेती है वहाँ वह प्राइवेट सेक्टर को नहीं आने देती। दिल्ली शहर में उसने रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट को लिया है, वहाँ प्राइवेट सेक्टर को नहीं आने देती, लखनऊ में नहीं आने देती, लेकिन ग्राम तौर से जगहों पर बस सर्विसेज प्राइवेट सेक्टर में भी चल रही हैं और पब्लिक सेक्टर में भी। जहाँ जहाँ पर भी परिवहन योजनायें हैं वहाँ दोनों क्षेत्र साथ साथ काम करते हैं। एक का ही मामला ऐसा था जो कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में मर रहा था तब गवर्नमेंट ने उसे ले लिया और उसको लेने के बाद उसके दो क्षेत्र बना दिये, एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र और दूसरा राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र।

आज हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय क्षेत्र का नाम बदल रहे हैं। जैसाकि श्री माथुर साहब ने कहा
2049 (A) LSD—6.

कि अगर यह प्रमैडमेंट आया होता कि दोनों को एक कर दिया जायतो शायद हमारी सुविधा बढ़ती। दोनों को किसी एक गरज से अलग किया गया था और आज भी दोनों अलग हैं। अगर दोनों को मिलाया जाता तो शायद सुविधा होती और अच्छा ही होता, लेकिन वह अलग बात है। यह जो दफा १८ के अन्दर संशोधन करके यह प्राइवेट सेक्टर को दिया जा रहा है, उसका मैं केवल इस कारण समर्थन करता हूँ कि अभी तक भारत के अन्दर चलने वाला जो हमारा एअर कारपोरेशन है वह सफल नहीं हो पाया है। अब बड़ी मुश्किलों के बाद गत बजट में, २ लाख या पता नहीं कितने का मुनाफा दिखलाया था और वह भी बहुत खींचतान कर दिखलाया था। यह घाटे पर ही चलता था। जहाँ जहाँ आप चलाते थे, वहाँ भी आपने बन्द कर दिया। भोपाल में बन्द हुआ, गोरखपुर में बन्द हुआ। बजाय इस सर्विस के कार्य क्षेत्र को बढ़ाने के आपके कारपोरेशन का काम कम कर दिया गया। किस कारण कम किया गया, यह आप जानते हैं अच्छी तरह से, मैं नहीं जानता। जहाजों की कमी हो या शायद किसी और चीज की कमी हो, या किराया अधिक हो और अधिक लोग उन पर न चढ़ते हों। आपके जहाज हैं लेकिन आप लोगों की मनोवृत्ति जहाजों की तरफ बढ़ा नहीं सकते। जहाँ जहाँ प्राइवेट सेक्टर के जहाज चल रहे थे वहाँ वहाँ आपने बन्द कर दिया। यहाँ एक कलिंग एअरलाइन्स है जो कि त्रिपुरा में जाता है, वह वहाँ लोगों की सेवा करता है जहाँ पर कि आप पहुंच नहीं पाते। कुछ और क्षेत्र थे जहाँ आप नहीं जाया करते थे उन्हें आपने दे दिया ताकि मुकाबिला अच्छा हो सके। कहा जाता है वह शायद कुछ बुरा व्यवहार करते हैं, क्या बुरा व्यवहार करते हैं, यह मुझे पता नहीं, क्या अंडरकॉटिंग वह कर रहे हैं यह भी मुझे पता नहीं। हमारे दूसरे भाई, कम्प्यूनिस्ट पार्टी के, श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने कहा कि उनकी शेड्यूल लाइन है। दोनों आर्गुमेंट दो तरह के निकले। वे कहते

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

हैं कि भले ही वे नान शेड्यूल्ड हों लेकिन उनके टाइम टेबल छपते थे। अगर नान शेड्यूल्ड होते हुए वे शेड्यूल्ड रूप से गचलते थे तो किसी आधार पर चलते थे जिसके लिए आप कहते हैं कि बड़ी गड़बड़ी थी और खास परमिट पर चलते थे। अगर सही तरीके से एकट को हम मानते हैं और उनको भी शेड्यूल्ड मान लेते हैं तो अगर चोरी से या किसी के प्रभाव में आकर उनको चलने की आज्ञा दे रखी थी तो हम आज सही तरीके से और कानूनी रूप से उनको चलने की आज्ञा देते हैं तो हमें कहना चाहिए कि जहां हम छिपे रूप से काम करते थे वहां अब हम खुले रूप में काम करेंगे, और यह देश के हित में ही होगा। अगर इस तरह से आप सेक्शन को अमेंड करे और औरों को भी आने दें इस क्षेत्र में तो शायद देश में इसमें और भी बढ़ोतरी होगी।

दूसरी बात श्री मधोक ने और कही कि ईश्वर न करे, शायद कभी लड़ाई का जमाना आ गया तो हमको जहाजों की अधिक जरूरत पड़ेगी। जहां तक अपने कारपोरेशन का सम्बन्ध है, वह जहाजों की संख्या नहीं बढ़ा पाता। अगर हमको अधिक जहाजों की जरूरत है तो इस जरूरत को पूरा करने के लिए भी जरूरी है कि जितने भी हवाई जहाजों को उड़ाने वाले और इस सेवा को लेने वाले आगे आयें, हमें उनको इस काम को करने देना चाहिए। उनके धन से एयर में उड़ने वाली प्रवृत्ति लोगों में पैदा होगी और अगर कभी कोई बात हुई तो नये जहाज देश के काम में लगेंगे। अगर इस तरफ भी खयाल किया जाय तो भी जरूरी है कि एयर कारपोरेशन के साथ औरों को हम चलने दें ताकि जरूरत पड़ने पर हमारे देश में जहाजों की कमी न हो। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समय काश्मीर की घटना घटी थी उस समय शायद यह कारपोरेशन नहीं था, यह काम प्राइवेट क्षेत्र में ही था

और उनकी मदद लेकर हमने सेना भेजी थी और उसने हमारी रक्षा की थी। इसी तरह से आज भी अगर प्राइवेट सेक्टर में यह काम आ जाय तो अच्छा होगा। लेकिन वहां आने के बाद अगर कारपोरेशन यहां बैठ कर उनको परमिट न दे तो यह ठीक नहीं होगा क्योंकि आप के हुक्म से ही उनके विमान चलेंगे। अगर आप खींचतान कर उनके विमान नहीं चलने देंगे तो वे कभी भी एअर माइन्डेड नहीं होंगे। जिस कंजरवेटिव स्पिरिट से या संकीर्णता से आज काम हो रहा है अगर उसी तरह से आप उनको काम नहीं करने देंगे तो काम नहीं चलेगा। अगर आप प्राइवेट सेक्टर को परमिट देना चाहते हैं तो खुले दिमाग से दीजिए। जो हमारे प्राइवेट सेक्टर के काम करने वाले हैं वे सब गवर्नमेंट के रुपये से काम करने वाले हैं। पर यदि वहां परमिट का सवाल पैदा हो और एयर कारपोरेशन उस के बीचमें भी आ जाय तो काम नहीं चलेगा।

मैं फिर अपने डिप्टी मिनिस्टर साहब का ध्यान दिलाना चाहूंगा खास तौर से गोरखपुर की तरफ। उसकी ओर कई बार ध्यान दिलाया भी गया है। वहां पर आपने इस एअर सर्विस को बन्द किया और एअर स्टेशन बना दिया। वहां पर लाखों रुपये खर्च कर दिये, आपने वहां बिजली का भी इन्स्टालेशन कर दिया, लेकिन एअर प्लाइट को बन्द कर दिया। मैंने पूछा कि आखिर यह दुतर्फा पालिसी क्यों? एक तरफ तो आप उड़ान बन्द कर रहे हैं और दूसरी तरफ बिल्डिंग बना रहे हैं। तो मुझे जवाब दिया गया कि यह काम दूसरे का है। बिल्डिंग बनाने का काम दूसरे का है और हवाई जहाज उड़ाने का काम दूसरे का है।

Shri Mohiuddin: I never said so.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह: जो आप का बिल्डिंग बनाने का विभाग है वह अलग है और एअर

कारपोरेशन अलग है। जब मैं बिल्डिंग विभाग वालों से मिला तो उन्होंने मुझे बतलाया कि स्टेशन बनाने का काम हमारा है, हम हवाई स्टेशन बनाते हैं और अब यह कारपोरेशन पर है कि वह विमान उड़ाये या न उड़ाये। एक तरफ तो एरोड्रोम बनता है और दूसरी ओर कारपोरेशन विमान उड़ाना नहीं चाहता। उस में प्राइवेट लोगों को उड़ाने दिया जाये। अगर उस में प्राइवेट लोगों को भी नहीं उड़ने दिया गया तो उस में जंग लग जायेगा। जिस बिल्डिंग में चिराग नहीं जलता, वह अगर नई भी हो तो भी गिर जाती है। यह खुशी की बात है कि इस एअरोड्रोम को सेना ने ले लिया है, लेकिन अगर सैनिक विभाग ने भी लिया है तो क्या उस में कुछ सैनिक आयेंगे? सैनिक हमेशा सैनिक विमानों पर ही नहीं आयेंगे। उन के आने जाने के लिये और हवाई जहाजों की व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये। गोरखपुर में एक फर्टीलाइजर फैक्टरी बन रही है। वहां पर जापानी लोग आते हैं, उन का कहना है कि उन के लिये हवाई जहाज की सविस नहीं है और इस की बड़ी दिक्कत है। यूनिवर्सिटी वहां है, रेलवे हैडक्वार्टर्स वहां हैं। इंजीनियरिंग कालिज वहां बनने जा रहा है। ये सब चीजें वहां हैं लेकिन आपका कारपोरेशन वहां से अपने हवाई जहाज नहीं उड़ाना चाहता।

15 hrs.

श्री हरिश्चन्द्र माथुर : ऐसा तो जोधपुर में भी है।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : जोधपुर में भी बहुत पहले यही हुआ था।

तो मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर आप गोरखपुर से अपने हवाई जहाज नहीं उड़ाना चाहते तो प्राइवेट कम्पनी को ऐसा करने की इजाजत दीजिये ताकि वह वहां से अपनी हवाई सरविस चला सके। न तो आप स्वयं इस काम को करते हैं और न दूसरों को करने की इजाजत देते हैं। इसलिये मेरा अनुरोध है कि इस ऐक्ट के पास जाने के बाद अगर आप खुद गोरखपुर

से हवाई सरविस न चलाना चाहें तो किसी कम्पनी को ऐसा करने की इजाजत दे दें। ताकि वहां आने जाने की सुविधा उपलब्ध हो सके और वहां का काम आगे बढ़ सके।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस अमेंडमेंट का समर्थन करता हूं। लेकिन मैं देखता हूं कि मंत्री महोदय अपना सिर हिला रहे हैं जिस के मानी हैं कि वह किसी और को यह काम करने की इजाजत नहीं देंगे। तो फिर यह अमेंडमेंट करने से फायदा क्या?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप उन के सर हिलाने की परवाह न करें, अपनी बात खत्म करें।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : मैं खत्म करता हूं : लेकिन अगर वह खुद यह काम नहीं करना चाहते और दूसरे को भी करने की इजाजत नहीं देना चाहते तो क्या श्री मधोक के शब्दों में यह काम किसी व्यक्ति विशेष के लिये किया जा रहा है।

Shri Prabhat Kar: After having heard the speech of my hon. friend Shri Harish Chandra Mathur and also those of the other hon. Members who have spoken on this, I feel that the most important point at issue in this Bill is whether the amendments proposed to be made through this Bill go against the spirit of the Industrial Policy Resolution or not. My hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta said that it went against the spirit, of the Industrial Policy Resolution. Taking the two together, I would say that it goes against both the letter and the spirit of the Industrial Policy Resolution, 1956.

While I was hearing the speech of the hon. lady Member who spoke, I was just wondering whether we were discussing today what should be our economic policy for the future. But she forgets that we have already adopted the Industrial Policy Resolution in 1956, and she was a Member of this House at that time.

An Hon. Member: She was not.

Shri Prabhat Kar: I think she was a Member in 1956. At that time, the question of allowing competition, and allowing the private sector to grow along with the public sector etc. was discussed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is now past 3 p.m. We shall have to take up the motion regarding the Report of the Hindustan Machine-Tools Limited now. Would the hon. Member like to continue tomorrow?

Shri Prabhat Kar: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue his speech tomorrow.

15.03 hrs.

**MOTION RE: ANNUAL REPORT OF
HINDUSTAN MACHINE-TOOLS
LIMITED**

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): I beg to move:

"That this House takes note of the Annual Report of the Hindustan Machine Tools Limited for the year 1959-60 along with the Audited Accounts and comments of the Comptroller and Auditor-General thereon, laid on the Table of the House on the 4th August, 1960."

While I move this motion, I suffer from one big handicap and it is this namely that though I am going to discuss the report for the year 1959-60, the report for the year 1960-61 has also been laid on the Table of the House. Unfortunately, the report for 1960-61 was laid on the Table of the House only recently, that is, a few days ago, and, therefore, I could not include it in the motion which I am making today. But when I compare the report for 1959-60 with the report for 1960-61, I feel that the pattern of working and the pattern of development and the motivation for working and the motivation for development are the same. The Hindustan Machine-Tools Limited has forged certain rails, and on those rails it is

running. Unless something new happens, I think that this factory, in spite of the fact that it has made a few experiments, will be a kind of a stereotyped factory after some time. It is not so just now, but it settles down to be like that, because all Government Departments evolve something, and having done that, they find it so difficult to make a departure from the lines of development they have laid down or from the lines of advance that they have adopted. That is what usefully happens. I hope that the Hindustan Machine Tools Limited will not get into a rut after some time but will go on doing things in the way in which it has been doing things upto this time, that is to say, that it will show plenty of scope for new ventures, plenty of room for new developments and plenty of initiative and spirit of adventure. This is what I feel. I only want to sound a note of warning that it should not fall into that kind of trouble or that kind of activity which leaves no room for further initiative.

The industrial map of India is a map of which any country can be proud. When I look at this map as a citizen of India I feel very happy. I feel especially happy about that part of it which is called the public sector. If I were to describe the two sectors in terms of colour, I would say that the public sector is the white colour and the private sector is the grey colour. But I am concerned at this time only with the white colour. I feel that our public sector has moved with a speed which cannot be paralleled in any other country of the world. It has developed a spirit of dynamism which is very remarkable. It has shown the capacity for new ventures which are really remarkable.

The public sector of the industrial map begins from Kashmir and goes down to Cape Comorin. It is to be found in Assam and all other parts of India as well. I am glad that my State also has some share of it,