

this House to show that a company which had a capital of £80,000 or about Rs. 8 lakhs in 1943, has a capital today, of roughly—it has been split up into two companies now—Rs. 100 lakhs, and money has been pumped in to the tune of not less than Rs. 60 lakhs, which is nearly 750 per cent. of the original capital. Obviously, somebody has made this money at the expense of the poor consumer, whose demand is extremely elastic, may I tell my hon. friend Shri V. B. Gandhi?

All this will again be discussed when we bring in the Coffee Bill. It is Government's intention that the coffee producer must be given a fair deal. It is also Government's intention that the small producer must be protected. Otherwise, tomorrow I can dissolve the Coffee Board, and the prices will find their level, and I can always regulate the exports, so that the prices can be depressed, and the consumer benefited, but then the small man who produces about 1½ cwt. per acre will go to the wall whereas a man who produces 8 to 10 cwts. will make a profit. It is not our intention to allow the small man to go. We shall devise, with the help of people like Shri A. V. Thomas, who know the industry, some method by which we shall put an additional burden on the man who makes more, subject to the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution, so as to give the small man some kind of a rehabilitation allowance. It shall be our attempt to devise that, when the Coffee Bill is brought forward for discussion.

For the nonce, all that I have to say is that this export duty has been levied in a very fair manner, i.e. whatever profits we make out of it, we share equally with the Coffee Board. Normally we would be making by way of excise duty at the rate of about Rs. 21 per cwt., about Rs. 17 lakhs on 4000 tons and the additional amount that we are getting by this export duty is about Rs. 33 lakhs, on the 4000 tons which we might export. And the Coffee Board

will be making the same amount, and this amount will be available for them to subsidise the prices for the consumer.

That more or less covers the good intentions—they say oftentimes that hell is paved with good intentions—of my hon. friend Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, who wanted this amount to be earmarked for a particular purpose. I have already cushioned this export duty in such a manner that the money will be available to the Coffee Board.

I have nothing more to say at this stage. However I am grateful that much as some members had to say against the Government's policy or lack of policy or whatever it is, the House generally approved of this levy of an export duty.

**Shri A. V. Thomas:** May I make one submission, Sir? The hon. Minister stated that Robusta coffee grows wild. That statement is not correct, because Robusta coffee does not grow wild.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** In relation to 'Plantation A', it does.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall now put the Resolution to the vote of the House. The question is:

"In pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 4A of the Indian Tariff Act, 1934 (XXXII of 1934), the House of the People hereby approves of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry S. R. O. 1904, dated the 10th October, 1953, by which an export duty of Rs. 62-8-0 per cwt. was levied on coffee with effect from the date of the said notification."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### DHOTIES (ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTY) BILL

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari):** I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of an ad-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

ditional excise duty on dhoties issued out of mills in excess of the quota fixed for the purpose, be taken into consideration."

I do not propose to tire the House in regard to the background to this Bill, because most hon. Members know about it, and very possibly, most hon. Members will express their opinions in regard to the policy of Government, covered by this particular measure, to which I will have to offer some kind of a reply.

The history of this Bill is this. This is a Bill which supports an ordinance, and replaces it as well. This ordinance was issued on 26th October 1953. There have been a few changes in this Bill, from what is contained in the ordinance. In the ordinance, the term 'permissible quota' was defined as follows: "The permissible quota of dhoties which may be packed during any quarter ... by any mill shall be one-fourth of sixty per cent. of the total percentage of dhoties packed by that mill during the relevant period." In the Bill, however, the word 'packed' occurring for the first time, has been substituted by the word 'issued'. This will mean that the excise duty will be charged on whatever cloth is cleared and not packed. If the cloth is packed and kept in the mill, excise duty will not be charged; it is only when it is cleared, that a duty will be charged.

A proviso has been added to Explanation 1 under clause 3, with a view to providing a fixation of quota in the case of those mills which did not exist during the relevant period, or which came into existence during this period, but did not actually work on dhoti production, or perhaps did not work on full production.

The House would be aware that some time towards the end of November 1952, the Government issued an order, asking the mills to restrict their production of dhoties

to 60 per cent. of their production during the year ending 31st March 1952. This was done, especially with a view to helping the handloom industry. In taking this period, the Government chose a period where the overall production of the country has been the highest, roughly about 50,000 bales a month, as against an estimated demand of 45,000 bales. We fixed the quota at about 60 per cent. viz. 30,000 bales a month. We felt that in actual fact, the reduction would be limited to the extent of 33 1/3 per cent., and not 40 per cent., so that there will be a little cushioning thereby.

The Textile Commissioner was also authorised in individual cases, to allow certain relaxations. Certain mills were so placed that they could not shift their production to other types of cloth. So far, the Textile Commissioner had allowed relaxations only in the case of 11 mills. Seven out of these are situated in the State of West Bengal, and one in Orissa. These mills have been permitted to produce up to about 80 per cent.

In actual fact, the overall production of dhoties from the period of December 1952—we did not take into account very much the production in December 1952, we started only from January 1953—has been well below the 30,000 bales limit which we fixed. We find that it has been fluctuating in the region between 28,000 and 29,000 bales. So, if we have to assess the benefit or otherwise of this levy, we are in a position to do so.

There has been an overall reduction, and if any benefit has accrued thereby, well, we can say it has. If it has not, it is not because of there being any attempt to defeat this order but because of other causes. So, that, I humbly submit, is one factor to be taken into consideration when hon. Members offer criticism of this measure or on Government's policy.

The other fact, Sir, is that it is true that in certain areas which we

call deficit areas, namely, they do not produce enough cloth for consumption in that area but are dependent on mills producing cloth elsewhere, notably Bombay and Ahmedabad, the restriction has been affecting them to some extent adversely. We have had certain cases where State Governments have felt the restriction was hampering local consumption. This also is a fact that oppresses some hon. Members.

In the case of finer dhoties, the prices went up in certain areas by 30 per cent. and even more. I am told it went up to even 40 per cent; I do not know how far it is true. But my figures show only up to 30 per cent. In the case of coarse, medium and fine qualities, they have gone up anywhere between 10 and 20 per cent. It is nothing surprising, Sir. My hon. friend, Mr. Gandhi, would perhaps tell me that it is bad economics to restrict production and it is even worse as an economic device, to make one industry a parasite on the other. Well, sometimes when we are faced with desperate situations, we seek desperate remedies, which is the only justification for tying up the well-being or production of one industry with the well-being or production of another industry which economically is in an inferior or lower position, so far as its ability to take care of itself is concerned. I am not really going into this question at this stage whether what we did is right or whether what we did is justifiable. I am only stating the facts. Here restriction has been imposed and in response to it in the areas which are deficit and where perhaps the handloom industry does not produce much of dhoties, the prices have gone up. And to that extent State Government have to ask the Central Government to allow greater relaxation. In fact, in West Bengal there has been a certain amount of misbehaviour on the part of the mills, very possibly in some cases justifiably, because in the case of three of the mills I think the quotas that we fixed did not take into account the facts of the situation, namely, they started production only in 1952.

they were refugee mills and various other factors for which we have to give weight. But nevertheless, the other mills have also taken advantage of the situation. Of course, the remedy is to prosecute them. But we felt on more mature consideration of all these facts and after consulting the State Ministers, partly by correspondence and partly orally, that we had better devise a self-adjusting mechanism by which we will put an artificial restraint on production. And if people transgress it, some portion of the excess money that they hope to make by selling their goods at a higher profit would be mopped up by means of an excise duty. I am not saying, Sir, that this device is very clever; I am even prepared to say it is clumsy. But it is a device, none the less, and I do not think, Sir, with the limited experience that I possess of the textile industry that the device might conceivably work. That is all, Sir, that I have to say in regard to the measure before the House.

I will offer one word of explanation, Sir, with special reference to the susceptibilities of my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram. We issued an Ordinance merely because we felt the position was rather urgent and had to be dealt with immediately. We cannot go on countenancing what is *per se* a defeat of a control order. In several cases, there was justification, a justification strong enough to make us desist from undertaking the logical course of a control order being disobeyed, namely, prosecution. I share with my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, the abhorrence of short-cut legislation, and I have no doubt, Sir, that if I were on that side of the House or even a free Member, I should have voiced my protest in as loud and emphatic a language as my hon. friend did. But here in this case I would like to mention to him a person who, even with his abhorrence of short-cut legislation, has found a justification even for that type of legislation being in the Constitution.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam):** How long are you going to keep your fetters on?

**The Minister of Commerce (Shri Karmarkar):** Notice.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Well, Sir, in human affairs, one cannot predict about the future. Some people go to astrologers, but I prefer to wait on events.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram:** Or is it a Swan song?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly indifferent to what shape events take. Please do not take it as a threat of resignation. I am not resigning.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Do dhoties include sarees also?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** No, Sir. Not in this instance.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Here only the width is given, not the length.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It does happen that in the case of a particular State, the people use the same length for sarees and dhoties. If it happens that people are for the reason of a penal excise duty prepared to use a longer dhoti—instead of 8 cubits, 10 cubits—and thereby evade this restriction, they are welcome to do so, even though the price of that additional 2 cubits will act as a check which we intend it to do.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** But this stands in the way, 'commonly known by that name'. Sarees of 8 cubits may be produced under this 'dhoties', but because it is not called 'dhoti' but only 'saree', it may escape.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It is merely a matter of length. If actually the fair sex are prepared to use dhoti of only 4 yards—they are progressively coming down and you, Sir, know in our part of the country our women folk were originally used to know of 9 yards length and they have now come down to 5½ yards and they might come to 4 yards.....

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is no limit round 4 yards.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** We have not put any limit because a dhoti will vary from place to place.

I do say, Sir, that there are possibilities of evasion. I do not say it is a foolproof legislation, but it is intended essentially as a check and as a self-acting device so that anybody who wants to transgress...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Why not say 'dhoti' includes saree?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** We do not want a restricted production of sarees for the reason that I would be rather chary of doing anything which will wound the susceptibilities of the fair sex. It is bad enough that I have to deal with these men and I certainly won't do anything which would affect either the prices or the supply of sarees.

**The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi):** In the same way as 'man' includes 'woman', 'dhoti' includes 'saree'.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Obviously, Sir, when we accept Hindi as our State language, we have to remedy that defect. It is apparently a language which needs quite a lot of revision.

Sir, that is roughly the position in regard to this measure. I am expecting, Sir, a lot of criticism. I know—my hon. friend is not here—Mr. Sinhasan Singh was very anxious to speak and a number of hon. Members also. I shall try my best to meet all the points as and when they arise. For the time being, I have nothing more to say.

Sir, I move.

**Several Hon. Members rose—**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I will first of all give preference to hon. Members who wear dhoties and then to those who wear trousers. Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of an additional excise duty on dhoties issued out of mills in excess of



the quota fixed for the purpose, be taken into consideration."

**Shri Heda (Nizamabad):** This Bill has not come as a surprise to me. In fact when we levied a cess on all the cloth in the mills with a view to encourage the handloom, at that time many remedies were thought of, and one of the remedies was—I think it was Rajaji who suggested it first—to restrict the production of dhories in the textile mills. And, that was done. To the extent of 40 per cent. the production of dhories was restricted. That proved a good check. There is no doubt about it. My own reading of the situation is that, at least in my State where there are a good number of handloom weavers, I find that they were on the verge of collapse then and now they are not collapsing. They are not becoming prosperous as they would like to be or as the case was a few years before; but this much is certain, that because of the cess and because of the restriction, the weaver is able to live, is able to stand on his own legs, and the great calamity that was facing us was averted.

Sir, in our country the problem is not only greater production through the mills or big industries. Rather, the main problem before us is the fuller employment of our people because somehow or other we are overpopulated and the growth of agriculture and other raw materials is not enough. Therefore, employment as it ought to be is not there. We cannot compare ourselves with the advanced countries like America and others because there employment is full. There, the daily wages of a man are many times more than they are in our country. They are the countries where one does not hear about a domestic servant while we have got a good number of them; because to maintain a domestic servant there is not an easy task. Therefore, Sir, according to me, the most important problem that faces our country today and, I hope that would remain facing

us for 5 or 10 years to come, would be the fuller employment.

One of the main criticisms that were levelled against our Five Year Plan by Vinobaji was also this. He said that he does not see the full employment in the Plan as it was originally proposed. But, thanks to his criticism and the criticisms that followed—I include my hon. friend Shri S. N. Agarwal whose efforts in this direction were successful—in the final draft of the Five Year Plan, some importance was given to this employment aspect of the whole national problem. After the Plan was laid before us this problem assumed still greater proportions and today it is the most important problem before us.

Sir, in the last session, on various occasions, some points were made by friends who come from what the hon. Minister has termed as the deficit area, particularly the State of West Bengal. I remember my friend who sits behind me, Dr. Das had been always raising his voice that in his State there is a shortage of dhories because of this restriction, and, therefore, at least so far as that deficit area is concerned, this restriction should not be there. But, I think this Bill has come very handy for the people who are in the deficit area. They have got one advantage. The bulk of the dhories are produced in Bombay and Ahmedabad and they are taken over from there to Calcutta and other places. Though the cost price of the Calcutta dhori may be lesser than the cost price of dhori produced at Bombay or Ahmedabad—when the railway freight is not included in it—yet selling price at Calcutta is the same. I mean this; there is a tendency in the deficit area, particularly in the producers of the deficit area to calculate the cost of their article by including the train freight and other charges. For example, in the South we are short of sugar. In my own State, we have surplus of sugar. But we do not get sugar at reduced rates there. The producers of sugar in Hyderabad always calcu-

[Shri Heda]

late the price of sugar on the basis of what it would be if it were to be brought from U.P. or Bihar, and they sell it at that rate. In the same way it happened in West Bengal. Therefore, the mills in West Bengal who would like to produce more or rather who were producing more in spite of the restrictions can now produce by giving this additional charge or duty and thereby they would be able to compete with the mills in Bombay or Ahmedabad.

**Dr. M. M. Das (Burdwan-Reserved-Sch. Castes):** A very nice solution.

**Shri Heda:** According to me it is a nice solution. But, Sir, as friends would have noticed, I have given notice of some amendments and I feel that the rate that is charged is rather high. I would like that the rates should not be so high at least in the initial stages because I know another aspect of the problem. The mills or the industry in West Bengal or what is called the deficit area are not so advanced as in Bombay or Ahmedabad. Therefore this high rate, at least in the beginning, would not work well. I am very anxious to give all encouragement to the mills in the deficit areas to produce a greater number of dhoties and thereby meet the demands of the people of their own areas and I would like that the rates that have been proposed in the Bill should not be so exorbitant and that they should be reduced to near about 50 per cent.

Sir, there is one more point that I would like to deal with and that is about the relevant period. In the Bill it is said that the relevant period would be fixed by the Government through a notification. I would like that the Government fixes it as they did when they restricted the dhoties. The same arrangement should carry on and no new arrangement has necessarily to be made. There are very few mills that have been opened after the relevant period and therefore the same arrangement may be continued so far as the provisions of this Bill are concerned. Therefore this matter

should not be left to the discretion of the authorities concerned. Rather it should be specified here so that there may be no doubt about it or its execution in the minds of the people. It is just possible that after a time we may not need such a Bill and it may be that we may have to revise the rates. But this would be an experiment in the right direction, as it seeks on the one side to give protection to the handloom industry and on the other side to maintain competition between the handloom and the mill. At the same time, it seeks to maintain competition between mills which are very efficient and those which are less efficient or mills in the surplus areas and the mills in the deficit areas. Therefore, I welcome this move.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I would like to inform hon. Members as to what I consider to be the scope of the Bill. If I am convinced otherwise, I am prepared to allow full discussion. It is only an amending Bill.

**Several Hon. Members:** No, Sir: it is an Ordinance.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The Ordinance is only for the purpose of an amending Bill. Let us not now go into all the details of the original Bill. Hon. Members must confine themselves...

**Several Hon. Members:** Sir, it is an original Bill.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur Distt.—South):** It is the first Bill of its kind; it is not an amending Bill.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Already under the Tariff Act there is an excise duty imposed. This is only an additional excise.

**Shri G. D. Somani (Nagaur—Pali):** There was only restriction of production. This Bill is a new Bill; it is not an amending Bill.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is there no excise duty on cloth produced in this country?

**Shri G. D. Somani:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is not this an addition to that?

**Shri G. D. Somani:** It is an additional duty for a specific purpose.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There is already an excise duty on cloth produced in the country.

**Shri K. C. Sodhia:** That was by executive action, Sir; not by a Bill or an Act.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This Bill supersedes the ordinance. Am I right?

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur):** May I request you to look up page 5 of this Bill?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I now see that clause 6 says that the ordinance is superseded by this Bill. I don't know why hon. Members say "No, no; the ordinance stands."

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar:** This is not an amending Bill to any other bill.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** This is an amending Bill to the Tariff Act. That is my conception and I would like to be told if I am not right. Section 4(2) says that "the duty of excise referred to in sub-section (1) shall be in addition to the duty of excise chargeable on cloth under the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944 (I of 1944) and the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development..." The scope of the Bill is to impose an additional excise duty on additional cloth produced over and above the 60% allotted. Hon. Members will confine themselves to this and not to the 60% and 40%.

**Dr. Lanka Sudaram:** The Statement of Objects and Reasons says—

"With a view to assisting the handloom industry, the Government of India in January, 1953 passed orders restricting the production of dhoties by mills to 60%.."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Can we go on discussing the handloom industry? Whether this helps or does not help; in what other ways you can go on

helping the handloom industry; these have been discussed already. All that is relevant for the purpose of this Bill is only to be discussed now.

**Shri Gadgil (Poona Central):** Excuse me, Sir, for a minute. Even if this is only an amending Bill, the results that follow the enactment of this particular ordinance are matters of legitimate discussion. Already, as a result of what has been enacted, prices have gone up and if there is a further restriction on the manufacture of dhoties, what will be the effect on the vast population who use mill-made dhoties—not on some of us who use khadi. The entire textile policy, in my opinion, is a matter for legitimate discussion even if it is an amending Bill.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let me have one other point cleared. Did the House have an opportunity to discuss the question of 60 per cent. versus 40 per cent.?

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem):** It was by an executive order and so the point was never discussed here.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All right, the handloom will have its own way.

**Shri M. Khuda Baksh (Murshidabad):** Sir, the hon. Minister tried to tell the House that the...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member will kindly sit down for a minute and let all the other Members go on talking and finish it first. They can talk outside—they cannot disturb the House. I am really sorry to say this again. The hon. Member may proceed now.

**Shri M. Khuda Baksh:** The definition of 'dhoti' is likely to be construed, as it now stands, to include a sari. It says—

"(i) is manufactured by a mill either wholly from cotton or partly from cotton and partly from any other material;

(ii) contains coloured yarn on its borders;

[Shri M. Khuda Baksh]

- (iii) has a width ranging between  
 - twenty-eight inches and fifty-four inches; and
- (iv) is commonly known by that name;"

To me it looks that item (iv) is to refer to dhoti and the first three may also include a sari. Therefore, I consider that it is desirable that this may be clarified beyond any doubt as it is not the intention of the Ministry to bring in sari under the purview or mischief of this Bill.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is items (i), (ii) and (iii) and (iv), and not or (iv). Therefore it applies to all the items. Unless it is called dhoti, it will not come in here. If ladies also use dhoti,—I don't think that happens here—it will come under the purview of this Bill.

**Shri M. Khuda Baksh:** If it does not include sari, I am happy and appreciate the Minister's concession in this respect.

Coming to the Bill, this is a punitive measure. The Minister has said that he will collect a duty, but in effect, it is a fine. Let us see, Sir, the circumstances that have led the Ministry to bring in this Bill. They had passed an executive order imposing restrictions on the production of a certain type of textiles, namely, dhoties and saris, which are commonly manufactured in the textile mills in India. I should like to be enlightened on certain points before I can make my observations. Therefore, I will listen to the reply that the Minister makes to the speeches made in general on this question.

The Ministry must have had some machinery for imposing the restrictions. I rather imagine that the Ministry addressed the State Governments for co-operation with them in the implementation of their order. What that machinery was the House is yet to know.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Is it not a fact that there is a central Excise Officer in every mill having an eye on every day production?

**Shri M. Khuda Baksh:** It was an executive order. I want to know what was the machinery that was employed to see to its implementation that mills conform to the desire of the Government, regarding the production of dhoties by all mills to the permissible limit of 60%. We should also like to know from the Ministry where are those offending mills. The Minister has been good enough to say that by and large the mills have been in accord with the desire of the Ministry and they have conformed to the order and implemented the restrictions, but there are yet certain offending mills. We should like to know their location.

**An Hon. Member:** In West Bengal.

**Shri M. Khuda Baksh:** An hon. Member has just now said they were in West Bengal. It may be in Bihar also and there may be other mills located elsewhere in India. Therefore, it touches me as I come from Bengal and I should like to know why is it that those Bengal mills offended against a Central decree? If it was left to the State Government to see to its implementation, why should that State Government feel constrained not to implement it? Sir, I remember that a question was asked in the House as to whether or not the Bengal mills had produced in excess of their quota and what the Central Government proposed to do to bring the refractory mills to book. The House was also told that the West Bengal Government did not quite see the desirability of interfering with the production by these mills. *A priori* I should suggest that there must be very sound and justifiable reasons for the West Bengal Government not to interfere with production by textile mills.

Now because this Government, the Government of West Bengal, felt that

it was in public interest to continue production of certain types of textiles, they continued to do so. The Bill has been brought before Parliament for making it a penal offence. Let us consider how exactly these punitive measures affect the mills.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Are they prosecuted for this?

**Shri M. Khuda Baksh:** Well, Sir, the duty is in the nature of a fine, because it says that there will be a permissible quota and if any mills produce in excess of that permissible quota, for 12½ per cent, they will be levied a duty, which is a fine of two annas per yard. If they produce more than 25 per cent. beyond the permissible quota, it would be three annas and so on. It is a graduated affair. Now, Sir, in Bengal, the mills are so equipped, mechanically and otherwise, for the production of dhoties and sarees mainly. If you restrict the production of dhoties and sarees of those mills, it will lead to rendering capacity surplus of those factories, and it will then lead to unemployment, because if we enforce this, or if we succeed in enforcing this—we do not mean to succeed, because we have made it an offence—they can get away with it by paying that extra fine. I shall come to it later, when I come to compare the advantages and disadvantages of the effect this will have on the price structure of the entire textile products, and I shall then have occasion to mention that later. Now, I shall confine myself to this aspect of the question which is that the mills are mainly equipped for the production of a particular kind of textiles, and if we are going to restrict that particular kind, it will cause hardship to those mills. This is what probably weighed with the Government of the State of West Bengal in not interfering with their production programme, and they allowed the mills to produce what they wanted and what they could produce consistent with the demand in the country and consistent with economy.

Another thing that I would like this House to bear in mind is the character of the capital that is invested in these mills in West Bengal. The House knows that most of those mills are virtually refugee mills, that is to say, Sir, they have salvaged the capital from mills now existing in East Bengal and they have moved whatever they could salvage, and they have brought them over to West Bengal and employed in the mills. They have so equipped the mills as to meet the requirements of the market. If this operates in Ahmedabad, whatever restrictions are imposed, they can make good the loss in production of dhoti by switching over to other kinds of textiles, poplins and other things. But in West Bengal the other kinds of textiles have no market—these fine shirting and other textiles. Therefore, whatever loomage there is at present will remain idle because of this restrictive order, and that will result in unemployment.

The next question that arises is: what machinery will Government employ to enforce this Act. I am apprehensive on this account. I, as a consumer, will not be able to tell which particular dhoti has been produced within the permissible quota and which particular dhoti has been produced outside the permissible quota. I would know, Sir, that a dhoti produced outside the permissible quota shall involve me in paying more—if it is within the 12½ per cent—to the tune of 12 annas or 10 annas per dhoti, and the shopkeeper would be perfectly justified in asking me to pay the 10 or 12 annas that he has to pay to the millowner and the millowner has to pay to the Excise Department by way of duty under this Act. Not knowing which one has been produced within the permissible quota which will bear no such additional duty and which one has been produced outside the quota, there will be a pool and the prices will be pooled and an average will be charged. What will be the result? I shall be called upon to pay, if I want a mill-made dhoti in

[Shri M. Khuda Baksh]

preference to the handloom dhoti, more than what I am paying now. It will not surprise you if I tell you that this very news has resulted in a sharp rise in price, as it is, in the finer counts. Government charges excise duty, etc., and cesses are collected, and this will be an additional burden passed on to the consumers.

[SHRI PATASKAR in the Chair]

Therefore, the result will be, when we want to punish the mills for not toeing the line, shall we say, of the Commerce and Industry Ministry, the penalty will be realised from the consumer who, willingly or unwillingly, has to buy a mill-made dhoti.

A Bengali whose chief article of wear is dhoti and kurta—for all formal or informal gatherings people go in dhoti and kurta—would not probably like to buy khadi or the cottage industry articles. A person there would like dhoties of finer counts. I want this House to bear this in mind that this, in effect protects the khadi and handloom products to the extent of the duty that shall be realized under this Act. But it will still be a mill-made cloth, cheaper in point of price than khadi or a product of cottage industry. Therefore, people would be prepared to pay the higher price and still have to buy mill-made cloth. Therefore, I cannot understand the reason or logic of this Bill. Let me be pardoned—I do not understand this, and I hope the Minister will tell the House and me the reason and logic behind this Bill, because if we want to punish the millowners, we can punish them by sending them to prison. I understand that. "You have violated orders; you are convicted and you go to jail". But, Sir, permitting them to produce cloth over and above the permissible quota and then charging the price and realising the fine from the poor consumer who is already very hard hit as it is, and making things go further beyond his buying capacity, I submit, is beyond my comprehension.

Again, this will have the effect of placing the Bengal produced dhoties and sarees at a serious disadvantage vis a vis the Bombay and Ahmedabad produced sarees. It is apparent that this Bill has been designed against those mills of Bengal and Bihar who have produced for very good reasons—I do not know what the reasons are—but for very good reasons, more than what the Central Government thought they should produce. This will place their products at a serious disadvantage in point of price.

Now, Sir, I come to another question.

**Shri S. N. Das** (Darbhanga Central): Why did they produce?

**Shri M. Khuda Baksh:** They produced, because they invested money. Being industrialists and being interested in getting return for their money, they produced what they could sell. And if they produced what they could sell, and therefore had a turnover and made some profits, the Income-tax Department and the Excise Department were the happier for it.

**Shri S. N. Das:** Would you like them to be sent to jail?

**Shri M. Khuda Baksh:** I can understand that proposition. If you want to punish the millowners, do it. But when you say, 'punish the millowners', in effect you are punishing me. That is the point and that is the position which I do not understand.

Sir, no indication has been given as to how the money realised from this duty will be used. Will it be diverted to the khadi and cottage industries fund? Or, how is it going to be utilized? Coming to that, Sir, it would be pertinent again to ask, what progress had that particular Department made? How popular it has become with the Indian consumers—all this will have to be gone into and taken into consideration. Merely making speeches here in support of

khadi and cottage industries will take us nowhere. If we mean business, we must be able to tell the country that this is what we have achieved in that particular field and this is what we propose to do and this additional duty realized on this account will be sent there. Even there I would be one of those who would be questioning whether it is right and proper to give them any more money without going into the question and assessing what they have done and how far they have developed in the direction they are expected to develop.

5 P.M.

Sir, I have mentioned this—but I want to mention it again for the sake of emphasis—that this Bill will lead to all kinds of corrupt practices. I shall not say it will, because there are many mill-owners who are very straightforward, but it is likely to. As I said, I will not know which particular dhoti is within the permissible limit. I shall be saddled with an additional duty and there is bound to be an increase in prices. This will lead to all sorts of corrupt practices.

Therefore, I would request Government to examine this from all angles, they should call a conference of the so-called offending mills who did not quite see the reason of the restrictive order, or did not co-operate with the Central Government in restricting their products, find out if they have any reasons, valid reasons, to advance, and meet those reasons. Government have taken cognizance of the fact that there will be certain mills which are so equipped that they will be affected adversely by this order. For them a certain concession is proposed to be made. But I for one think that this concession is nowhere near enough. They will have to be consulted and their point of view met. These mills which are placed in a peculiar situation should not be penalised. They

should be given freedom to develop according to their own lights.

शंखल ठाकुर दास भार्गव (गुडगांव) :

यह बिल जिस शकल में प्राया है उस के उसूल को, कि मिल के कपड़े पर ड्यूटी लगायी जाये इस गरज से कि हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को फरोग दिया जा सके, तो हाउस तसलीम कर चुका है। यह सही है कि थोड़ा अर्सा हुआ हम ने खादी एंड हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री डेवेलपमेंट ऐक्ट, १९५३ पास किया और उस वक्त इस हाउस ने इस उसूल को मान लिया था कि मिल के कपड़े पर ड्यूटी लगाई जा सके ताकि उस रुपये से और उस मज्हीद रुपये से जो गवर्नमेंट इस बारे में देना चाहे, हम हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को तरक्की दे सकें और इस तरीके से जो देश में इतना इनएम्प्लायमेंट है उस को दूर करने में कामयाब हों, जिस वक्त यह बिल हाउस के एनबिल पर था उस वक्त भी बहुत सी तकरीरें हुई थीं और यह मामला हाउस में पेश हुआ था। उस बिल पर बोलते हुए मैं ने निहायत अदब से अनररेबिल कामर्स मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में अर्ज किया था कि आप उन अर्जनास में से हैं कि जो इम कांस्टीट्यूशन को बनाने वाले हैं, जिस कांस्टीट्यूशन में गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया पर यह जिम्मेदारी डाली गई है कि अपनी पालिसी से इस तरह से कार्यवाही इस देश में करे कि इनएम्प्लायमेंट खत्म हो जाये, यहां पर हर एक आदमी को खाने को रोटी मिले, पहनने को कपड़ा मिले, और सर इकने को छत मिल सके और यहां से इनएम्प्लायमेंट खत्म हो जाये। उसका एक जरिया जो उस बिल में सोचा गया और जिस के ऊपर आज गवर्नमेंट जोर दे रही है, वह यह था कि जहां तक हो सके काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज को बढ़ाया जाये। मैं देखता हूँ कि इस देश की काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज में एक बीविंग की

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

ही ऐसी इंडस्ट्री है जिस को तरक्की देने की गुंजाइश है। लेकिन ज्यों ही एक वीविंग मिल खुलती है उसका असर यह होता है कि हजारों जुलाहे बेकार हो जाते हैं। इस वास्ते इस जिम्न में जब इस देश के नेता श्री राजगोपालाचार्य ने यह तजवीज पेश की कि फिलहाल ४० फीसदी धोतियों को इंडलूम वीवर्स को दे दिया जाय और मिल्स को उन के बीच करने से रोका जाय, उस वक्त देश में इस तजवीज को ग्राम तौर पर सपोर्ट किया गया था।

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (जिला गोरखपुर दक्षिण) : उन्होंने ने तो सेंट पर सेंट कहा था।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : अगर यह झुहस्त है जैसा कि मेरे लायक दोस्त फरमाते हैं कि उन्हीं को यह सारा काम दे दिया जाय तो जो मैं प्रारम्भ कर रहा था वह और भी मजबूत हो जाता है। मैं ने हाउस में उस वक्त अर्ज किया था जिस वक्त कि यह खादी एंड इंडलूम इंडस्ट्री डेवेलपमेंट बिल आया था, कि गो मेरी राय में यह प्रैक्टिकेबिल नहीं है लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस देश के अन्दर एक एक कपड़ा जो बने वह इस देश के जुलाहों द्वारा बनाया जाय। यह स्वदेशी का मूवमेंट बंगाल में चला था, पर आज मुझे अफसोस है कि हमारे बंगाली भाई एक दूसरे के न में बोल रहे हैं। देश में इस मूवमेंट को बड़ा फरोग हासिल हुआ था। हमारे राष्ट्र पिता महात्मा गांधी ने यह हुक्म सादिर फरमाया था कि बिदेशी कपड़े को जला दिया जाय और उस वक्त हमने देखा कि बहुत जगह पर ढेरों बिदेशी कपड़ा जलाया गया। एक बहुत इंटरैस्टिंग डिबेट जो मुझे उ.प्र. जमाने की याद आती है वह हमारे

स्वर्गीय टैगोर महाराज और गांधीजी महाराज के दरम्यान हुई थी और वह पढ़ने के काबिल है। गो दोनों की राय मृतजाद थी लेकिन उन्होंने ने जो आर्टिकल मार्टिन रिब्यू में लिखे हैं वह पढ़ने के काबिल हैं। वह एक बहुत अच्छा मजबूत हमारे सामने पेश करते हैं कि उस जमाने में किस तरह से पालिटिक्स चलती थी इन आर्टिकल्स से उस वक्त की पालिटिक्स पर काफी रोशनी पड़ती है। लेकिन मैं इस वक्त उस में नहीं जाऊंगा। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि चन्द रोज हुए हाउस में हम ने इस अनएम्प्लायमेंट के मसले के ऊपर कई रोज खर्च किये थे। मेरी अदब से गुजारिश है कि मुझे अभी ऐसे पालिटीशियन से मिलना बाकी है जो मुझे यह यकीन दिला सके कि वीविंग इंडस्ट्री के अलावा और कोई दूसरी ऐसी काटेज इंडस्ट्री है जो कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा एम्प्लायमेंट दे सकती है। मैं जानता हूँ कि अभी यह प्रैक्टिकेबिल प्रापोजीशन नहीं है कि सारा कपड़ा वीवर्स ही बना सकें। बंगाल के भाई यह शिकायत करते हैं कि इंडलूम से इतनी धोतियां नहीं बन सकती कि जो मिल की धोतियों की जगह पूरा काम दे सके। मैं इस चीज से वाकिफ हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम एक सिन्चुएशन को बिल्कुल तबदील करना चाहते हैं तो उस में तकलीफ जरूर होगी और इस तकलीफ को हम को बरदास्त करना होगा। जब कि वह बिल आया था तो मैं ने अर्ज किया था कि मैं वह दिन देखना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश का सारा कपड़ा इंडलूम के जरिये बने और साथ ही मैं ने यह भी अर्ज किया कि हर एक हिन्दुस्तानी को यह मान लेना चाहिए कि अगर वह चाहता है कि आयन्दा हिन्दुस्तान में अनएम्प्लायमेंट न रहे तो उसका एक जरिया यही है कि सब



लोग हैंडलूम के कपड़े पहनें। आज सरकार ने एक एग्जीक्यूटिव आर्डर पास किया कि ४० पर सेंट धोतियां बनाने की मानोपली हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को दी जाय और ६० रहे मिलों के पास। इस हाउस की उस बारे में बिल्कुल राय नहीं ली गयी और मैं गाडगिल साहब से सहमत हूँ कि हाउस को उस पर अपनी सय देने का मौका होना चाहिए था। मुमकिन है कि बहुत से असह्य की रायें मुझ से इतिफाक न करती लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ कि हाउस के सामने दोनों साइड्स धा जातीं। मेरी राय तो यह है कि उन को सेंट पर सेंट धोतियां बनाने की मानोपली मिल जाती। पहले धोती की मानोपली मिलती और बाद अर्जां सारे कपड़े का मामला हैंडलूम को दे दिया जाता और हमारी मिल्स सिर्फ स्पिनिंग करती। इस देश के अन्दर स्पिनिंग रेम्यूनेरेटिव नहीं है। अगर रेम्यूनेरेटिव होता तो मेरी सेंट पर सेंट राय है कि स्पिनिंग और वीविंग के जरिये इस देश से अनएम्प्लायमेंट दूर हो सकती है।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह (हजारीबाग पश्चिम) : स्पिनिंग भी रेम्यूनेरेटिव है।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : मैं पिछले तीस बत्तीस साल से खादी का काम करता चला आ रहा हूँ और मैं ने यह देखा है कि स्पिनिंग के जरिये ग्राम तोर पर लोगों को इतनी ग्रामदानी नहीं होती जिस से उन का गुजारा चल सके। इस बास्ते मेरी यह राय है। मैं जानता हूँ कि मेरे बहुत से दोस्तों की राय, जिन की मैं बहुत कद्र करता हूँ, यह है कि अगर हालात तबदील कर दिये जायें तो स्पिनिंग भी रेम्यूनेरेटिव हो सकता है। अगर यह तजुरबा कामयाब हो सके तो मैं चाहूंगा कि दोनों ही काम हाथ से किये जायें और मिलों को इजाजत न दी जाये कि वह हजारों आदमियों की रोजी मारें।

तो अब इस को इम्प्लीमेंट करने का कौन सा तरीका है। क्या उस को इम्प्लीमेंट करने का यह कायदा है जैसा कि गवर्नमेंट कर रही है। और यह बिल हमारे सामने लायी है। अभी हमारे बंगाल के दोस्त ने बतलाया कि यह तो मिलों को सजा नहीं बल्कि कनज्यूमर को सजा है। मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस सरकार ने यह कानून पास कर दिया और उस में इस बात की पूरी गुंजाइश रखी है कि जिन मिलों के पास धोती बनाने का ही काम है उन का कोटा भी बढ़ा रखा जाय दूसरों के मुकाबले में, तो फिर यह कौनसा तरीका है कि आप एंडीशनल इयूटी लें। इस हालत में जो मिल कसूर करेगी तो उस का क्या नतीजा होगा? उस का यही नतीजा होगा कि जो हालात आप सन् १९५३ के बिल के जरिये बनाना चाहते हैं वह नहीं बनें और न इस से बीवर्स को फायदा पहुंचता है। जिस सिबुएशन का आप इलाज करना चाहते थे उस का इलाज इस से नहीं होगा।

लेकिन आप कैसे कहते हैं कि इस का इलाज यह है कि उस के ऊपर दो आने गज, चार आने गज, छः आने गज या आठ आने गज से उन का भाव बढ़ा दें। अगर आप इस तरह से बढ़ा देंगे तो जो कुछ मिलों को देना पड़ता है, उस से उन को नुकसान नहीं होता। उन को जो इयूटीज देनी पड़ती है, उस को वह दूसरों पर पास कर देते हैं। बल्कि बूकि कंट्रोल हट गया है तो उस से वह ज्यादा कमा सकते हैं। तो इस से मिल वालों को गेंन है, नुकसान नहीं। उन का तो फायदा है अगर उन का माल बिक जाय और ज्यादा कीमत पर बिक जाये क्योंकि प्राइस कंट्रोल नहीं रहा है, तो क्या होगा? वह इसमें भी ज्यादा फायदा उठावेंगे और उन को १५

[ पंडित ठाकुर दास भागवं ]

इसेटिव होगा कि वह इस कानून को तोड़ें। क्या कोई ऐसा भी कानून बनता है कि जिस में कानून तोड़ने वाले को सजा न हो बल्कि फायदा हो। मैं भ्रदब से भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह तरीका इस को रोकने का जायज नहीं है। दर भ्रसल जो सिचुएशन है, जो गवर्नमेंट चाहती है, जो गवर्नमेंट के दिल में है, वह जो स्टेटमेंट आफ आबजैक्ट्स एंड रीजन्स के पहले फिकरे में दिया हुआ है। वह क्या है ?

"With a view to assisting the handloom industry, the Government of India in January, 1953, passed orders restricting the production of dhoties by mills to 60 per cent. of their average monthly production during the period April, 1951 to March, 1952."

यह दुस्त है कि हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को मदद देने की खातिर यह किया गया है। लेकिन मैं भ्रदब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो रुपया एंडीशनल ड्यूटी के जरिये हासिल होगा, यह कहाँ जायेगा, इस का क्या होगा ? यह सरकार के खजाने में जायगा, लोगों की तनखाह बढ़ाने में जायगा और गवर्नमेंट के काम करने में जायगा, जनरल रेवेन्यू में शामिल होगा। अगर हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को असिस्ट करना है तो इस रुपये को आप वहाँ लगावें जहाँ कि इस को लगाना है। मैं भ्रदब से भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम यह बीज तो इस में रखनी चाहिये थी कि यह रुपया हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री की मदद के लिये काम में लाया जायगा। अभी जो प्रावीजन है वह काफी नहीं है। अगर आप हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को फरोग देना चाहते हैं तो आप को वह प्रावीजन करना चाहिये या कि लोग मजबूर हो कर बीवर के बने हुए कपड़े को पहनने लेंगे। अगर कपड़े की कमी होगी तो वह

ज्यादा कीमत का रुपया बीवर के पास जावेंगे। लेकिन यह तो एक तरह से यह हुआ कि घड़े में आप पानी डालना शुरू करते हैं और नीचे उस के सूरख कर देते हैं, तो वह घड़ा पानी से कैसे भरेगा। मैं भ्रदब से भ्रज करूंगा कि यह कायदा ठीक नहीं है और यह तरीका जो आप ने अख्तियार किया है यह ठीक नहीं है। जो मकसद आप हासिल करना चाहते हैं वह दर भ्रसल इस से हासिल नहीं होगा। फायदा नहीं तो कम मे कम यह तो इस में रख देते कि जो एंडीशनल ड्यूटी होगी वह तो हंडलूम के काम में लगेगी, यह फायदा तो हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को पहुंचाया होता। अभी तो इस से एक तरफ फायदा गवर्नमेंट उठाना चाहती है कि गवर्नमेंट के जनरल रेवेन्यू में रुपया चला जाय और दूसरी तरफ मिल वालों को यह फायदा देना चाहती है कि वह चाहे जिस कीमत पर बेच लें। जब जरूरत होगी तो लोग ज्यादा कीमत दे कर भी वह कपड़ा लेंगे, आठ आने गज ज्यादा होगा तो वह भी देंगे।

इसलिये या तो ऐसी सूरत हो जाये कि हंडलूम में ऐसी धोतियाँ बनें जिस से मिल इंडस्ट्री का मुकाबला किया जा सके, वह इतनी नरम हो, खूबसूरत व सस्ती हो। लेकिन यह फिर भी सप्लाई और डिमांड का सवाल है। सप्लाई और डिमांड के लाज इतने रूयलैस हैं कि वे कभी काबू में नहीं आ सकते। मैं समझता हूँ कि सप्लाई और डिमांड के कायदे के बाहर आप नहीं जा सकते। इस वास्ते मैंने दो एक प्रमोडमेंट भेजे हैं, जो गालिबन अगर यह बिल कल तक चलेगा तो हाउस के रूबरू आजावेंगी। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि आनरेबिल मिनिस्टर साहब को बं मालूम हो चुकी होगी। मैं भ्रदब से यह भ्रज करना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो रुपया

इस में से हासिल हो वह सारे का सारा रुपया हेडलूम इंडस्ट्री की इमदाद में खर्च किया जाय ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि आज में समझ सकता हूँ उन मँम्बरों की शिकायत जो कि बंगाल से तशरीफ लाये हैं कि वहाँ पर घोटियां नहीं हैं और गरीब आदमी जिस को धोती और कुरता ही इस्तेमाल करना है, वह भी उस को नहीं मिल पाता । मैं जानता हूँ कि दुनिया में कपड़े का और जगह क्या मौसत है । कहीं कहीं चालीस गज मौसत है, मैं वहाँ की बात नहीं करता, हमारे देश में ११ से १५ गज तक का मौसत है । तो जहाँ यह मौसत है, वहाँ में किसी कंज्यूमर से यह नहीं कह सकता कि यह कपड़ा भी उस को मुहैया न हो और वह इतना कपड़ा भी न पहने । इन्सान नंगा कैसे रह सकता है ? अगर उस को कपड़ा मिलेगा तो जरूर मिल क्लाय इस्तेमाल किया जायगा । आप थोड़े से आदमियों से ऐक्सपैक्ट कर सकते हैं कि वह खादी पहिनें । लेकिन जब तक कि खादी बमुकाबले मिल के कपड़े के सस्ती और अच्छी नहीं होती, तब तक आप सब को इस खादी के पहनने के लिये मजबूर नहीं कर सकते । मिल का कपड़ा तब तक जरूर खरीदा जायगा जब तक कि वह मिलेगा । इसलिये जब कि वह कपड़ा खरीदा जायगा और चूँकि मिल के कपड़े में कोई खराबी नहीं है, हमारे मिल का कपड़ा बाहर भेजा जाता है, इसलिये जो भी दाम होंगे लोग देंगे । अगर हमारे मिल के कपड़े में खराबी होती तो वह बाहर नहीं भेजना चाहिये था । आज जो कपड़ा हमारे मिलों के अन्दर बनता है और बाहर के मिलों का जो कपड़ा आता है, तो मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि बदरजे बाहर के कपड़े के मैं चाहता हूँ कि

लोग हमारे मिलों का बना कपड़ा पहिनें । बमुकाबले फौरन क्लाय के मैं चाहता हूँ कि लोग हमारा मिल मेड क्लाय इस्तेमाल करें । इस वक्त दिल्ली के बाजार में अगर कोई बाहरी आदमी जा कर देखे तो वह हैरान हो जायगा कि क्या यह देश भूका है, जहाँ करोड़ों रुपये का फौरन क्लाय सुबह से शाम तक दुकानों पर बेचा जाता है । उस को देख कर हमें शर्म आती है । कोई वक्त था कि जब सुरेन्द्र नाथ बनर्जी ने स्वदेशी का मूवमेंट चलाया था और लोगों ने फौरन क्लाय लेने से मना कर दिया था । लेकिन आज उसी देश में विदेशी कपड़ा आराम से आता है । पिछले दिनों हाउस को याद होगा कि नौ करोड़ रुपये का कपड़ा इस देश के अन्दर इम्पोर्ट किया गया । हम ने पंडित नेहरू साहब से, प्राइम मिनिस्टर से, शिकायत की कि यह कैसा तमाशा हिन्दुस्तान में है कि महात्मा गांधी के देश में विदेशी कपड़ा इस तरह से आता है कि जिस तरह से वह नहीं आना चाहिये था । उन्होंने ने कहा कि मुझे इस का कुछ पता नहीं कि कैसे आ गया, कामर्स मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछो । उन से पूछने पर वह कहते हैं कि हम को पता नहीं कि किस तरह से आ गया । तो नौ करोड़ रुपये का कपड़ा इस तरह से हमारे देश में आ गया ।

इसलिये अगर आप सचमुच हेडलूम इंडस्ट्री को अस्सिट करना चाहते हैं तो पहला काम तो आप के लिये यह है कि आप बाहर के फौरन क्लाय का यहाँ आना बिल्कुल बन्द कर दीजिये । अगर आप बिजिनेस भी न करते हैं, अगर आप चाहते हैं कि इस देश में स्वदेशी मूवमेंट जोर पकड़े, अगर आप चाहते हैं कि अनएम्प्लायमेंट दूर हो, तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह इम्पोर्ट बिल्कुल बन्द कर दिया जाय । यह अनएम्प्लायमेंट तभी दूर होगी जब कि यहाँ की इंडस्ट्री को आप ऐनकरेज

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

करेंगे। जब कि इस देश की बनी हुई चीजें ही आदमी इस्तेमाल करेंगे। आप देखिये कि किस तरह का कपड़ा इस देश में पैदा नहीं हो सकता सिवाय ऐसे कपड़े के और कपड़े को इम्पोर्ट न होने दीजिये। क्या आप बाहर का कपड़ा मंगा कर इस तरह की खराबी बढ़ाना चाहते हैं कि यहां के लोग देश में अनएम्प्लायड रहें और भूकों भरें और बाहर का कपड़ा लोग पहिनें। रस्किन ने क्या कहा था कि फ्रेज और बेगज का रेंज पर यकसां असर होता है। आप अगर मिल वालों को फरोग दें बमुकाबले फारेन कैपिटलिस्ट के तो मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि बमुकाबले फारेन क्लाय बालों के आप यहां के मिल वालों को फायदा पहुंचायें। लेकिन जहां तक रेंज का सवाल है, जहां तक अनएम्प्लायमेंट का सवाल है, जहां तक गरीब आदमी का सवाल है, उस के वास्ते दोनों या फोरेन क्लाय व मिल क्लाय का असर एक ही है। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि देश में अनएम्प्लायमेंट दूर हो तो यहां पर स्वदेशी की नयी स्पिरिट को लाना पड़ेगा। आप उस के लिये यह ४० परसेंट धोतियों को क्यों लेते हैं? आप को तो सारा कपड़ा हंडलूम से बनवाना होगा। मैं जानता हूँ कि आप आज यह एक दम से नहीं कर सकते हैं। अगर आप आज कर दें तो देश में एक कैंटस्ट्राफी आ जायेगी जब कि कपड़े की इतनी कमी है। आप आज इस को नहीं कर सकते। मैं इस के लिये इस कदर फ़ैनेटिक नहीं हूँ। लेकिन मैं यह जरूर चाहता हूँ कि फोरेन क्लाय को बिल्कुल नहीं आने देना चाहिये। आप इस को बन्द नहीं करते और साठ और चालीस परसेंट धोतियों के अंशट में पड़ जाते हैं। आप ऐसे काउंट्स (counts) का कपड़ा जो हंडलूम में इस्तेमाल होता है मिल्स से बनवाना बन्द कर दें और यह सारा

का सारा कपड़ा हंडलूम से बनवाना शुरू कर दें—तो ज्यादा प्रभावित होगा।

मैं एक प्रपोजीशन और रखता हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि देश में कपड़े की कमी है। अभी तक हंडलूम ने इतनी तरक्की नहीं की कि हम को इतनी धोतियां मुहैया कर सके कि हर एक आदमी पहन सके। इसलिये आप कम से कम एक साल की मुहलत दीजिये कि सन् १९५४ के बाद उस तरह का कपड़ा मिल्स के अन्दर न बने। मैं इस के लिये नहीं कहता कि एक साल ही हो, एक साल हो या दो साल हो, या चाहे जो भरसा हो, उस के तय करने के लिये मैं गवर्नमेंट को ही बंस्ट जज समझता हूँ कि वह इस को तय करे। उस के पास ऐक्सपर्ट्स हैं, मैं तो लेमैन की हैसियत से एक उसूली बात पेश करता हूँ कि एक साल के बाद या ऐसे अरसे के बाद जिस को गवर्नमेंट मुनासिब समझे, अगर गवर्नमेंट के परमिसिबिल कोटा के ऊपर अगर कोई कपड़ा बनावे तो यही नहीं कि उस पर यह ऐंडीशनल ड्यूटी लगे, बल्कि उस का वह कपड़ा भी फोरफिट कर दिया जाय। अगर आप यह चीज रखेंगे तो उन को मालूम होगा। ड्यूटी भी देनी पड़ेगी और कपड़ा भी फोरफिट होजायगा तो शायद उन पर कुछ प्रभाव पड़े और वह धोतियों के बारे में आप के हुकम को मानना शुरू करें।

इस के अलावा और दूसरी चीजें हैं। कमी कमी आप बहुत ड्रैस्टिक स्टेप लेना चाहते हैं और बड़े सक्त कानून आप पास करते हैं। कितने ही बिल आप के देखे हैं, मिल पर भी आप कब्जा करते हैं, मिल का हिसाब भी ले लेते हैं और डायरेक्टर्स को

भी निकाल देते हैं। इस से क्या मैं नतीजा निकालूँ कि आप इस बिल के बारे में बहुत सिमियर नहीं हैं क्योंकि जुर्म के लिये जो सजा है वह बहुत मीठी है। क्या मैं यह नतीजा निकालूँ कि अभी मिल मालिकों के हक में जो उन के दिल के अन्दर साफ्ट कानैर है, उस के अन्दर अभी सस्ती आना शुरू नहीं हुई है? मेरी अदब से गुजारिश यह है कि अगर आप दरअसल इस मामले को ठीक नुकते निगाह से जांचना चाहते हैं तो पहली चीज जो मैं अर्ज करूँगा वह यह है क्योंकि, सारी टेक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री और सारी पालिसी इस वक्त हाउस के सामने है, मैं अदब से आप की खिदमत में अर्ज करूँगा कि जितना बाहर का कपड़ा आता है उस कपड़े में से केवल उस कपड़े को छोड़ कर जिस की बहुत ज्यादा जरूरत हो और जिस के मंगाये बगैर काम नहीं चल सकता हो उस कपड़े को छोड़ कर आप बाकी सारे कपड़े का इम्पोर्ट बन्द कर दें और ऐसा करने में आप को कोई नुकसान नहीं होगा।

दूसरी चीज मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर को पालिसी और कोशिश यह होनी चाहिये कि आयन्दा जितना कपड़ा है इन्डसूत्र से बन सकता है, आप मिन में उस कपड़े का बनना बन्द कर दें, यह मैं जानता हूँ कि इस से मुमकिन है मिल की वह मशीन आइडिल पड जाय, लेकिन यह कैसे हो सकता है कि मशीन आइडिल न पड़ी रहने देने के लिये हम इंसानी मैटीरियल को भूखा रखें? मशीन भले ही इस कदम से आइडिल पड जाये, लेकिन हम इंसान को भूखा नहीं रहने दे सकते। इसलिये अगर आप इस देश से अनएम्प्लायमेंट हटाना चाहते हैं, इस देश के गरीब आदमियों का भला करना चाहते हैं तो मेरा कहना है कि आप की पालिसी तो सही है लेकिन उस का इम्प्लीमेंटेशन बिल्कुल

गलत है। इस किस्म का बिल जैसा कि यह है, उस को तो मैं कभी सपोर्ट नहीं करता अगर उस के अन्दर यह बात नहीं होती कि आज भी हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर धोतियों की जरूरत है और गरीब आदमी बगैर धोतियों के आप को नंगे देखने को मिलेंगे और आप के सामने वही दृश्य आयेगा जो सन् ४३ में उड़ीसा में देखने को मिला था। महात्मा गांधी जब वहां तशरीफ ले गये तो औरतें घर से बाहर नहीं आती थीं, क्यों कि उन के पास अपना तन ढाँकने को कपड़ा नहीं था, मैं नहीं चाहता कि हमारे देशवासियों को फिर वह नजारा देखने को मिले। गवर्नमेंट अन-एम्प्लायमेंट को दूर करना चाहती है तो सीधे तरीके से दूर करे और मैं चाहूँगा कि अगर ऐसा आप कर सकें तो बेहतर, लेकिन कम से कम इस बिल के अगाराज के वास्ते फौरन यह दो अर्मेंडमेंट जरूर मानने चाहियें जो कि मैं पेश कर रहा हूँ योकि मैं जानता हूँ कि यह जिस को आप एडीवनल इप्टी कह सकते हैं, यह बिल्कुल एक बेअसर चीज है। जहां तक मिल्स का ताल्लुक है, उन पर कोई असर नहीं पड़ेगा, खसूसन उस मिल को जिस कपड़े पर लास होगा, जो उस पर एडीवनल इप्टी होगी, वह पबलिक पर पास कर देंगे। इस मीके पर मैं कुछ और ज्यादा अर्ज नहीं करना चाहता, मेरे और बहुत से दूसरे दोस्त बोलने को उत्सुक हैं, इसलिये मैं अपनी बात खत्म करता हूँ।

**Shrimati A. Kale (Nagpur):** Mr. Chairman, I am thankful to you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity to say a few words on this Bill. Many of the arguments that I wanted to put forward have already been advanced. One thing that I would like to say at the outset is that I am surprised to find my hon. friend from Bengal advocating the cause of mill-owners from Bengal.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** There are many others.

**Shrimati A. Kale:** Let me tell him that the mill owners are very shrewed, expert business men and what is more, they are very influential. We need not take it upon ourselves to advocate their cause.

With regard to this Bill, I would like to say that in our Standing Committee for Commerce and Industry when the first meeting was held, I had suggested to the hon. Minister that if we want that the handloom industry should survive, we should see that sarees and dhoties are produced by handlooms only and that we should make an advance towards that end..

[**PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA** in the Chair.]

I am not arrogant enough to say that the present Bill is the result of my suggestion. But, I am glad to find that the suggestion that was made by me has come into force though partially. At this moment, I would like to request the Government to make an announcement that within a specified period they will see that dhoties and sarees are produced by handlooms only and that mills will not be allowed to produce any dhoties at all.

Secondly, in the definition of dhoties, it has been suggested that they have a coloured border or border of any kind. I have seen dhoties which have no border at all. What I am afraid is this. The mill owners, in their anxiety to make money will make dhoties without borders, or dhoties which have white borders. That also should be included here.

Thirdly, what I would like to suggest is this. A levy of excise duty is not justified. After all, whatever the rate of excise duty will be, it will be recovered from the consumer. As it is, you know, that the consumer is hard hit. The price of dhoties has gone to such an extent that an

ordinary man is not able to purchase dhoties. If this additional excise duty is levied, it will mean that the consumer of dhoties will have to take recourse to something else against his wish or desire. What I suggest is that if any mills are found to commit an offence, that is producing dhoties more than 60 per cent, they should be either fined or prosecuted, or the extra material that is produced by the mills should be confiscated by the Government. Whatever is practical or useful, I do not know. But, to levy an excise duty in this fashion is only to penalise the poor consumer. There is a saying in Marathi:

‘चोराला सोडून सन्याशाला शिक्षा’

that means that the thief is let off and the innocent man is punished. My earnest request to the Government is that they should find out the means by which the mill owners who are offending parties should be directly punished.

Then, Sir, I would like to say that there is a chance of sarees also being included. In my part of the country, and in some Hindi speaking areas, and even in Bengal, if I mistake not, dhoties include sarees and they are also worn by women. As it is, it is sufficient punishment to the middle classes who use dhoties. By any means, if it is interpreted to include sarees also, then, the women will be hard hit. I request that the Bill may be so revised that only the mill owners who offend may be punished. If, in the present Bill, it is found difficult to change excise duty into fine, my request is not to keep the gradation also. After all, if the mill produces 12 per cent or 50 per cent, the offence is bad enough and the offence is committed not only consciously but knowing full well that they will be able to influence the respective Governments and the respective authorities. Therefore I suggest that the gradation that is given here should be removed and if for some reason

they are not able to fine, the rates of duty should be the same throughout.

More than this, I would not like to say. I agree in principle that some sort of restriction has got to be put on the mill owners producing more; but Government should take care to see that the middle classes who are suffering so badly are not made to suffer more.

**Shri G. D. Somani:** Mr. Chairman, at the very outset, I would like to make it quite clear that I am not in any way opposed to the best possible aid being given to our handloom industry. If I say a few words about this Bill, it is more from the point of view of the consumers, because, fortunately at least in this case, the interests of the industry and the consumer are quite identical. Therefore, I need not say a single word from the view point of the industry.

So far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, I would first like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the Kanungo Committee which is at present going into this vexed question of the reservation of varieties for the different sectors of our textile production. Since this Committee has been making this enquiry for the last several months, Government could have very well waited for some more time, till the Committee makes its well-considered recommendations about this vexed question, before taking this drastic measure.

Even as things stand at present, as the hon. Minister himself pointed out, and as has been clarified even in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, on the whole most of the mills have complied with the restrictions that were imposed on the production of dhoties, but the fact remains that a few mills, mostly in Bengal and Orissa and other places which are deficit areas, did not comply with those restrictions, and that too with the full concurrence of the respective local Governments. At one stage we were told representations were made from

the Bombay Mill Owners' Association....

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I am afraid I have to enter a caveat against the statement made by the hon. Member that any transgression of these restrictions have been made with the full concurrence of the State Governments. That would not be correct. I do not know where the hon. Member gets his information from, but I am in a position to say that no State Government can give its full concurrence to any transgression of these restrictions.

**Shri Gidwani (Thana):** Full or partial?

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** Did any State Government give partial concurrence?

**Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour):** Did they give any qualified concurrence?

**Mr. Chairman:** It is possible the restrictions may have been put there with the concurrence of the local Governments, but the hon. Member has said that with the encouragement of the local Governments, some mills have produced more dhoties.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I would at once explain the position. State Governments, some of them, did not favour these restrictions, but that does not mean they were encouraging the mills in their unit to disobey the order. That is not correct. They make a representation. They say that is a point of view which has to be taken into account. I think it is perfectly correct thing to do but I do not think it is correct to say that the State Governments encourage the mills to defy such law.

**Shri G. D. Somani:** So far as my information goes, this Ministry at one stage wanted to prosecute all those mills which produced more than the stipulated quantity, but ultimately it was the State Governments, I think, which refused to comply with the matter.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Sir, I emphatically protest against a statement of that nature. There was absolutely no refusal and there can be no refusal.

**Shri G. D. Somani:** As a matter of fact, if the restriction as was desired in that order had been complied with, then, I do not think there was any necessity to bring forward this Bill for excise duty. As has been mentioned even in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, Government themselves realised that it is the easier way to achieve their object—to impose this excise duty rather than impose those restrictive measures which have not been carried out. The fact remains that during the recent Puja festival, when there was an acute shortage of dhoties in West Bengal, not only the Government, so far as the information of the industry goes, wanted the mills to produce whatever they could, whatever their capacity was, but they also put a ban on the export of dhoties that were imported into West Bengal by mills from Bombay and Ahmedabad. That shows the determination of the West Bengal Government to ensure supply of dhoties at reasonable prices for the public, and since these restrictive orders ran counter to their determination,—now that the hon. Minister has denied it, I will not say that they encouraged the mills to go against the orders of the Central Government—in any case, they were very anxious that there should be no restriction on the production of mill-made dhoties. And the situation remains, therefore, the same. It is clear, therefore, that the hon. Minister has yielded more to the vocal South than to what the Governments in the North have represented.

To make things clear, I think I cannot do better than quote what the hon. Minister himself said some time last year:

“It seems that consumers all over India want mill cloth which is cheaper. We cannot ignore the consumer's interest, which is the primary one with which we are concerned. We cannot ignore it, particularly at a time when he

wants more cloth, and we cannot reject this aspect of the question and accept a narrower view.”

Sb, my submission is this, that here, as he himself admits, there is acute difference of opinion among local State Governments. Several such State Governments want that the mills should produce dhoties and sarees to their full capacity and the consumer should get those dhoties and sarees at as cheap a price as possible. And, therefore, whatever policy then Government of India took, either in January in restricting the production of dhoties by the mills, or now in placing this punitive excise duty on the manufacture of dhoties, runs counter to the interests of the consumer which is represented by all these various important State Governments.

My hon. friend from Bengal said: how will the consumer know whether a certain dhoti has been subjected to this abnormal excise duty or not? That is not necessary. Perhaps, he does not know that now there is no control over prices, there is no price stamping, and as such the prices are regulated by supply and demand. Therefore, as soon as this Ordinance was promulgated, in spite of the fact that the prices of other varieties of textiles had been declining precipitously so much so that even the Government have admitted that the industry is faced with a crisis, even in the midst of that crisis, the prices of dhoties have flared up again. Dhoties are sold at a premium, higher than sarees which cost much more for the manufacturer to manufacture, and the position will be further aggravated if these very heavy excise duties which are now contemplated to be imposed on the manufacture of dhoties are implemented.

The fact is, and I would repeat it again, that there are various other more effective ways of assisting the handloom industry. The hon. Minister, while introducing this Bill, did not give any facts or figures as to how



these restrictions on the manufacture of dhoties and sarees upon the mills have benefited the handloom industry throughout the country. Now that those restrictions have been in operation for a long period it would have been interesting to get some idea whether the penalty which the consumers have been compelled to pay due to these restrictions is really benefiting the handloom weavers or not. This is again a hypothetical question, and so far as the industry's information goes, while the handloom weavers have not benefited to any extent from these measures, the consumers have unnecessarily been penalised. So, the remedy lies in various other things. This is neither the time nor the occasion to go into those various constructive measures by which the Government could assist the handloom industry, and I am glad that they have been doing so in so many directions, especially recently. But imposing these restrictions and this heavy excise duty on the manufacture of an essential commodity is not the way in which they should try to assist the handloom industry.

What is more surprising and inequitable is the fact that this excise duty will operate irrespective of the count or variety of the dhoties concerned. Whether the dhoti concerned is of coarse quality or superfine quality, it will be subjected to the same schedule of punitive excise duties. At least, so far as the common man is concerned, Government would have been very well advised to exempt the coarse and medium varieties from this excise duty. It could be restricted to the superior kinds, and if they liked, they could have imposed a more severe excise duty on the superfine and costlier varieties. From the point of view of the public that would have been more desirable than having a uniform excise duty on all varieties.

Much more could be said about it, but I still hope that at least so far as the millions of people in Northern India are concerned, whose interests

have been represented to the hon. Minister by the various State Governments, they will not be ignored in any steps that the Government of India takes to assist the handloom industry.

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री (जिला भाजमगढ़—पूर्व व जिला बलिया—पश्चिम): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे इस पर बोलने का अवसर दिया।

मैं इस बिल के उद्देश्य को समझा ही नहीं कि इस के लाने की क्या आवश्यकता हुई। यह बिल जिस रूप में हमारे सामने आया है उस से वह आदेश-पत्र जिस के द्वारा मिल के कपड़ों के उत्पादन पर कुछ प्रतिबन्ध लगाया गया था कि जिस से हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री (करघे के उद्योग) को प्रोत्साहन मिले, अपनी आत्मा में और शरीर में दोनों में समाप्त हो जाता है। जो प्रतिबन्ध लगाया गया या वह इस तरह से समाप्त हो जाता है कि अब हम मिलों को यह छूट दे देते हैं कि वह प्रतिबन्ध के आगे चाहे जितना भी कपड़ा पैदा कर सकती है केवल आवश्यकता उन को यह होगी कि वह हमें कुछ कर के रूप में भ्रवा कर दें। मिलों को मुनाफा कमाने की पूरी छूट दी जायगी बशर्ते कि उस मुनाफे में वह सरकार को साझेदार बना लें। तो जो प्रयोजन प्रतिबन्ध लगाने का था वह प्रयोजन कहाँ रहा? हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री का भला हो या बुरा हो सरकार को इस से मतलब नहीं है। सरकार को अब प्रयोजन इस बात से है कि उस के प्रतिबन्ध लगाने के कारण जो मिलों को अधिक कपड़ा बनाने की प्रेरणा हुई है उस प्रेरणा से अनुचित लाभ उठा कर उस मुनाफे में एक अच्छी साझेदारी प्राप्त की जाय। जो लोग मिलों का कपड़ा पहनने के

[श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री]

आदी है जब उन के पास दूसरा कपड़ा नहीं होगा तो वह उन को पहनेंगे और जो मूल्य उसका लगाया जायगा उस मूल्य पर वह उस को खरीदेंगे और इस प्रकार से हाथ से कपड़ा बनाकर जीविका चलाने वाले बुनकरों की तबाही हो जायगी। एक समय इंगलिस्तान की छींट और कपड़ों ने इस देश के अच्छे बुने हुए कपड़ों को तबाह कर दिया था और बुनकरों की बहुत बड़ी संख्या तबाह हो गई थी जब कि यहां पर ब्रिटेन की साम्राज्य शाही का बोलबाला था और उन का अपना यहां पर व्यापार था। धीरे धीरे फिर लष्टम पष्टम सन् १९२० में महात्मा गांधी ने एक बार फिर हाथ से बुनने वालों और कातने वालों की ओर देश का ध्यान दिलाया। जिस धागे के जरिये इस देश का स्वराज्य चला गया था उसी धागे के जरिये देश का स्वराज्य लेने का नारा उन्होंने बुलन्द किया। उस को सुन कर जैसा कि स्वयं श्रीमान् ने अभी कहा था इस देश में स्वदेशी भावना पैदा हुई और उस के कारण देश का ध्यान इस ओर गया। पिछले महीनों में जो हमारे बुनकरों की दुर्दशा हमारे सामने आई उस से हमारा ध्यान उस तरफ गया और हम ने हाथ से कपड़ा बनाने वालों की उन्नति के लिये एक योजना बनाई एक कर लगाया और मिलों के कपड़े पर एक प्रतिबन्ध लगाया कि इस हद तक मिलें कपड़ा न बनावें और इस से भागे न बनावें। यह इस दृष्टि से किया गया था कि बुनकर बेकारी के शंगुल से बचें और अपनी जीविका प्राप्त कर सकें। अब इस बिल में इस सारी भावना का लोप हो गया है। इस में हम ने केवल एक ऐडिशनल टैक्स लगा दिया है, लेकिन यह स्पष्ट नहीं किया है कि यह टैक्स किस काम आयेगा। अभी श्रीमान् भी स्वयं यही कह रहे थे और मैं भी इस प्रकार का संशोधन दिया है कि यदि वह बा होती ही है तो कम से कम

इस कर से जो आय होने वाली है वह एकमात्र इसी उद्योग पर, जो कि हाथ से कपड़ा बनाने का है, खर्च की जाये और सरकार की दूसरी भदों पर इस का एक पैसा भी व्यय न किया जाय। मगर मैं नहीं समझता कि यह भी उस का सीधा इलाज है। हम उस आमदनी से बुनकरों को कुछ पेंशन दे सकते हैं उनका कुछ गुजारा बांध सकते हैं और सम्भव है कि इस से यह हो सके कि जो कपड़ा वह बना कर लावें वह बाजार में मिल के कपड़े के मुकाबले में खड़ा हो सके और उस के खरीदार मिल सकें और हो सकता है कि वह इस प्रकार मिल वालों से कम्पटीशन कर सकें। मैं जिस क्षेत्र से आता हूँ वह बुनकरों का क्षेत्र है। मऊ, मुबारकपुर, कोभागंज, रसड़ा यह जो क्षेत्र हैं बलिया और आजमगढ़ जिलों में, उन के पूर्वी हिस्से में, वहां बुनकरों की बहुत बड़ी तादाद है। वह अच्छे किस्म का कपड़ा बुनते थे और बाहर के बाजार में बेचते थे। आज उन के ऊपर एक काइसिस है, आज वह संकट काल से गुजर रहे हैं। उन को एक आशा की किरण मिली थी कि एक हद तक उन को कपड़ों का स्वायत्त हासिल हो गया है, ४० प्रतिशत धोती बनाने का उन को अधिकार हो गया है और वही धोतियां बाजार में चलेंगी और वह उन धोतियों को बना कर और बेचकर अपना पेट पाल सकेंगे। सरकार ने यह दिशा दिखाई कि हमारा ध्यान तुम्हारी ओर गया है। वह चीज अभी पूरे तौर पर अमल में भी नहीं आई है। अभी कल हम यह चीज पढ़ रहे थे और अपने निर्वाचन क्षेत्र में लोगों को अपने यह विचार बता रहे थे कि सरकार का ध्यान गरीबों की ओर आकृष्ट हुआ है और बड़ी तादाद को प्राप्त होने वाले दुःख की ओर हमारी दयालु सरकार का ध्यान गया है, प्रजा की सच्ची प्रतिनिधि सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर गया है। अब कल हम यह कहेंगे कि अब कोई प्रतिबन्ध नहीं है।

मिलों को पूरा अधिकार है कि वह ग्रन्थाधुन्ध कपड़ा बनावें, धोतियां चाहे जितनी बनावें। उन का काम सिर्फ यह है कि कुछ पैसा सरकार को दे दें, और यह भी सही बात है जैसा कि अभी श्रीमान् जी ने ठीक ही कहा कि न केवल हम ने यह किया कि इस प्रतिबन्ध को हटा कर एक केवल ऐडीशनल टैक्स लगा दिया बल्कि हमने यह भी किया कि उस कर को सामान्य रूप से सब पर लगा दिया, चाहे धोती मोटी हो चाहे पतली हो, चाहे उसे अमीर पहनें या गरीब पहनें हम ने सब के ऊपर समान रूप से इस कर को बांट दिया है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि यह तुषार पात है, यह तो गरीबों के ऊपर वज्रपात है और आप इस बिल के द्वारा गरीब जनता की मदद नहीं कर सकते।

हां, यह बात सही है कि आज के युग में हम मिलों को, कारखानों को, महा यानों को, महा यन्त्रों को, नमस्कार नहीं कर सकते हैं। यह नहीं हो सकता कि हम आज बिल्कुल करघे से ही बनी हुई चीजों पर निर्भर रह सकें। आज के युग में यह बात सम्भव नहीं है। यद्यपि मेरे मित्र रामनारायण जी कह रहे थे कि सूत का कातना भी काफी मजदूरी दे देता है, लेकिन श्रीमान् जी, आप के तीस वर्ष के अनुभव का यह नतीजा है, यह परिणाम है, कि वह इतना पेइंग या लाभदायक उद्योग नहीं है। सही बात यह है कि आज के आंधी पानी के युग में, जब कि हवाई जहाज इतनी तेजी से चलता है तो न कोई पैदल चल सकता है और न बैलगाड़ी में चल सकता है। तो यह तो नहीं कहा जा सकता कि मिलों के लोहे को गला कर स्क्रैप प्राइवरन के रूप में बेच दिया जाय। वह तो बिल्कुल काल्पनिक बात रह जायेगी। किन्तु हमें इस के लिये सामंजस्य स्थापित करना है। हाथ के उद्योग धंधों की जो बात थी वह हमें इंडस्ट्रियल रिबोल्पुशन

में दिखाई पड़ी जिस का स्पष्ट चित्र हम कैपिटल में पढ़ने हैं कि किस तरह से हाथ के करघे के काम करने वालों ने मिलों को फूँका है, जलाया है। लेकिन आज वही अपने हाथों से मिलों को जलाने वाले लोग मिलों में काम करते हैं और कपड़े को बनाते हैं। तो यह क्रान्ति आई है। उस का नोटिस हम को लेना होगा और उस की हम उपेक्षा नहीं कर सकते। फिर इतनी बड़ी तादाद को तुरन्त, सद्यः, कपड़ा पहुंचा देना भी हमारे सामने बड़ी भारी समस्या है। हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने उसी बात को ध्यान में रख कर कहा था कि लोग कपड़ा चाहते हैं, वह क्या करें। वह उन की बेबसी है। जनता जो चीज चाहती है, उस से हम मुंह मोड़ नहीं सकते। लोग किनारदार धोती पहनना चाहते हैं इस का प्रबन्ध करना है। पहले हाथ के उद्योग धन्धों से काम होता था। गरीब लोग अपने हाथ से चक्की चलाते थे। अमीर औरतें भी चक्की पीसती थीं, आज वह मिलों में जा कर गेहूं पिसवा लेती हैं और अपने हाथों से उन्हीं ने काम करना छोड़ दिया तो जो हमारा वर्तमान युग है, जिस को कलयुग कहा जाता है, जो सच्चे मानों में कलियुग है, इस मशीन के युग से हम मुंह नहीं मोड़ सकते। लेकिन हम को इस के लिये सामंजस्य स्थापित करना होगा और उत्पादन बढ़ाना होगा। मुझे याद है श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण जी का वह वाक्य कि हमें उत्पादन बढ़ाने में यह नहीं देखना है कि यह किस तरह से बढ़ेगा। हम नहीं कह सकते हैं कि यह मिलों द्वारा नहीं बढ़ेगा, न यही कह सकते हैं कि हाथ के उद्योग धंधों से नहीं बनेगा। हमें परिस्थितियों के अनुकूल उद्योग धन्धों को बढ़ाना है, उत्पादन की वृद्धि करनी है। चाहे जिस मार्ग से हो हमें उत्पादन बढ़ाना है। उत्पादन बढ़ाने की तरफ हमारा ध्यान जाना चाहिये। जब तक इस के लिये सामंजस्य

[श्री अल्लू राय शास्त्री]

स्थापित नहीं होता तब तक बाजार की दुश्चारी पैदा हो जाती है। हम किसी एक ही चीज के आगे घुटने नहीं टेक देंगे। मैं ने खादी की प्रतिज्ञा ली है तो मैं उस पर चलता हूँ। लेकिन मैं इस को पूरी आबादी पर इम्पोज कर दूँ, जबरदस्ती लाद दूँ, यह सम्भव नहीं है। साथ ही केवल मिलें ही चलेंगी और इन उद्योग धंधों में लगे हुए लोग भूख से मर जायेंगे यह भी हम नहीं होने देंगे। हम ने अपने मामूली चीनी के व्यापार को विदेश के काम्पीटीशन से बचाने के लिये तरह तरह के संरक्षण दिये। तो इसी तरह हम को संरक्षण देने के लिये भी उद्योग धंधों को संरक्षण देने के लिये भी कुछ न कुछ व्यवस्था करनी पड़ेगी। आज यह जो व्यवस्था की गई है और यह जो आर्डर इश्यू हुआ था, उस को रद्द कर दिया गया, जैसे कि हाथ की मेंहदी शादी की मिटी भी नहीं थी कि वैधव्य दिखाई देने लगा, इस तरह की बात हो गई है। यह आर्डर लगा ही था कि प्रतिबन्ध लगे कि तब तक यह बिल उस आर्डिनंस को रद्द करने के लिये आ गया है।

श्री गाडगील : यह मेंहदी का क्या हुआ ?

श्री अल्लू राय शास्त्री : यह आप क्या जानें क्या हुआ, आप यहां नहीं थे।

श्री बी० ली० शर्मा (होशियारपुर) : यह आर्डिनंस क्या हाथ के लिये मेंहदी होता है ?

श्री अल्लू राय शास्त्री : जी हाँ, आर्डिनंस खूनी तो होता ही है।

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि कुछ दिन अभी बीते भी नहीं, अभी लोगों को उस की याद है

कि यह चीज आई है, वह प्रतिबन्ध थोड़ा सा ही हुआ कि जिस के द्वारा हम ने सोचा था कि कुछ सहायता हो गई, कि शीघ्र ही यह बिल आ गया है जो उस दिशा में हमें को एक कदम भी आगे नहीं ले जाता है। इस तरह यह जो एक हाथ का उद्योग धंधा है उस को यह समाप्त कर देता है। अक्सर हम यह कहते आये हैं, बराबर अनुरोध करते आये हैं कि . . . . .

श्री गिडबानी : कोई सुनता ही नहीं है, क्या समझेंगे।

श्री अल्लू राय शास्त्री : सब समझेंगे, आप शान्ति से सुनिये।

श्री गाडगील : वह दूसरों के लिये कहते हैं, जनता के लिये, फार बिगर प्लेटफार्म।

श्री अल्लू राय शास्त्री : आप श्रीमान् जो मुझे इन बड़े बड़े लोगो से प्राटेक्शन दीजिये।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may go on without minding the interruptions.

श्री अल्लू राय शास्त्री . जैसे यह बिल करघा उद्योग को तबाह करने वाला है, वैसे ही यह दो आदमी मुझे तबाह करने के लिये बैठे हुये हैं।

मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि खट्टर के उद्योग धन्धे के बारे में हम हमेशा सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित करते आये हैं कि वह अपने विभागों में तमाम कामों में खट्टर का प्रयोग कर सकती थी। उधर सरकार का ध्यान नहीं गया, इस से उस उद्योग धंधे को काफी धक्का लगा है। हम यह आशा करते थे कि हमारी खादी के प्रोटेक्शन के लिये जो कुछ यहां व्यवस्था की गई थी उस से कुछ उन्नति होगी। हम समझते थे कि उस उद्योग धंधे को उन्नत

किया जायगा और उस कोमदद मिलेगी दान दे कर, दान के रूप में या सहायता के रूप में, हम किसी उद्योग धंधे की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते। हम उद्योग धंधे की रक्षा कर सकते हैं। अगर वह दुर्बल उद्योग धंधा है तो सबल उद्योग धंधे के मुकाबले में उस को कुछ अवकाश दे कर, कुछ भूमि दे कर, कुछ प्रस्थान दे कर जिस से कि वह कुछ आगे बढ़ सके। इस तरीके पर हम यह नहीं समझते कि उस की रक्षा हो सकती है। इस के द्वारा आयो हुई आय को हम हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री पर खर्च कर दें, वही एक सुभाव मुझे इस समय सामने आता है, अगर यह बिल पास होता है। इस हालत में सिवाय मेरे उस संशोधन के कोई दूसरा रास्ता दिखाई नहीं देता। लेकिन मैं उस को सही रास्ता नहीं मानता। सही रास्ता तभी होगा जब कि सवमुच मिलों के उत्पादन पर कुछ प्रतिबन्ध लगाया जाय और करघे के उद्योग धंधे को पनपने और बढ़ने का अवसर दें।

तो मैं इस बिल के उस भाग के विरुद्ध हूँ जिस हद तक कि यह बिल उस आर्डिनेंस को जो पहले था उस को यह रिपील कर रहा है। उस आदेश पत्र को जिस के द्वारा कि प्रतिबन्ध लगाया गया था मिलों के कपड़े पर, जिस हद तक यह बिल रिपील करता है, उस में जहाँ तक यह बाधा डालता है, उस का मैं सर्वथा अस्वागत करता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कोई न कोई प्रतिबन्ध अवश्य हो : इस सामंजस्य को स्थापित करने के लिये बहुत शान्ति से सोचने की आवश्यकता है कि कहां तक हम हमारी जनता की जो आवश्यकता है, जो हमारी इतनी बड़ी आबादी की आवश्यकता है, उस आवश्यकता की पूर्ति में बाधक न हों और उन को कपड़े के अभाव में परेशान न होने दें। एक तरफ उस की तरफ हम को ध्यान देना होगा। दूसरी तरफ

अपने उस उद्योग धंधे को जो प्राज संरक्षण के बिना चल नहीं सकता। क्योंकि मिलों की चीरकार और चीख पुकार में, उस की आबाज कारखानों में तूती की आबाज कौन सुनेगा, किन्तु वह हाथ के उद्योग धंधे वाले रहेंगे कहां और खायेंगे क्या, तो उस के लिये हम को सामंजस्य स्थापित करने के लिये भी प्रयत्न करना है। तो इस दृष्टि से यह बिल स्वीकार नहीं होना चाहिये और इस को रिजैक्ट कर देना चाहिये।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूँ।

**Shri G. H. Deshpande** (Nasik--Central): I rise to support the Bill, but at the same time I would like to place before this hon. House the special circumstances that prevail in my constituency and State in this respect.

Sir, in Bombay State there are very big weavers' centres wherein the weaving industry is undertaken by a large number of people who depend for their livelihood on that industry. For instance, in my constituency, Malgaon is a big weaving centre. Sholapur is one of the biggest weaving centres in India. Ichalkaranji is also an important centre of weavers in the Deccan and Bhiwandi is also a centre of importance. If we take into consideration the present measure, as placed before this honourable House, it gives no relief, no protection to all these weavers, for they do not weave dhoties and the protection to dhoties will not serve the purpose which is in view so far as the weavers in my State are concerned. They take to weaving sarees and mostly in Deccan, almost all the women prefer handloom sarees to mill-made sarees. So far as I know, the same condition prevails in Madhya Pradesh.

**Shri Radhela Vyas** (Ujjain):  
Madhya Bharat.

**Shri G. H. Deshpande:** I do not know about that.

What I would like to place before this hon. House, Sir, is that the weavers in my State also are in a miserable condition.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Miserable everywhere.

**Shri G. H. Deshpande:** There is adequate cloth in the market. At the same time, there is no relief to the weavers. They remain unemployed. So we must think seriously of this situation and we must have, I am definitely of the view, a better measure which will meet the object in view. The present measure may be a good measure in itself, but it will not achieve the object it wants to unless and until it is further amended substantially.

6 P.M.

So what I want to place before this hon. House is that if you want to give protection to weavers, it is a very good object. Everybody is with you so far as that is concerned. But, at the same time please do not be under the impression that by means of this measure you will be giving any amount of relief to weavers in my constituency and State. They are in need of some relief; they are in a very miserable plight; something is being done for giving them some relief by the State Government with the aid of the Central Government. I do not want to place before this House that their case is altogether forgotten by this Government or the State Government. They are trying to look after their interest. But the method by which both the State Government and the Central Government are trying to solve this problem of the weavers is not going to benefit them or is not going to solve the problem. That must be realised and the sooner it is realised the better it is.

So, Sir, I would like to say that if you want to restrict the production of *dhoties* and give relief to certain weavers who take to *dhoties*, do it by all means. I am whole-heartedly for that. But, at the same time, why not restrict the production of *saris* also which will give protection to a large number of weavers who are taking to *saris* since generations. That is the thing that I want to place before the House. And, do not delay this measure. If you are out to give some relief to the weavers, do something substantial by which a large number of weavers will get some benefit. So, that is the thing that I want to place before this hon. House.

Ever since this Ordinance was in force, whenever I had some contacts with the weaving community in my constituency and in my State, this general grievance was spoken of by them and I do want to place all this in all seriousness before this hon. House and I would request, Sir, through you, the hon. Minister to take into consideration this and see that the weavers from my State will get something substantial without delay.

**Dr. Krishnaswami** (Kancheepuram): Mr. Chairman, The House must be thankful to the Minister for Commerce and Industry for having so tactfully avoided the issue of whether the handloom industry has been benefited or not. This is on its face a simple Bill. From one point of view there is no need to have a debate on it. But in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it is suggested that the Government intends to assist the handloom industry and has on this account passed an order restricting the production of *dhoties* by mills to 60 per cent. of their average monthly production during the period April, 1951 to March 1952.

I should like, at the outset, Sir, to point out that the prosperity of the handloom industry has to be taken into account by any Government which has the interests and welfare

of large masses of our countrymen at heart. I come, Sir, from a constituency in which there are a large number of handloom weavers. The prosperity of the area in which the handloom weavers live is inextricably bound up with the prosperity of the handloom industry. The Government passed an order some time ago restricting the production of mills to about 60 per cent. of their original production and the advisers of Government thought that by this order of reservation, they had done their duty by the Handloom industry. What has happened? How far has the Handloom industry benefited? The question of internal protection is one which cannot be lightly suggested as a panacea for the evils, which afflict small scale industries. I regret very much to say that many of the anticipations that some of us entertained regarding internal protection have not materialised in the least. I would like to point out to my hon. friends here that the dhoti as we know it is different from the dhoti as embodied in this bill. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read out the definition of a Dhoti. It reads as follows:

" 'dhoti' means any type of grey or bleached cloth of plain weave which—

- (i) is manufactured by a mill either wholly from cotton or partly from cotton and partly from any other material;
- (ii) contains coloured yarn on its borders;
- (iii) has a width ranging between twenty-eight inches and fifty-four inches; and
- (iv) is commonly known by that name."

Now, Sir, it is open to any mill to avoid or rather evade the restriction imposed by Government by not having coloured yarn on the borders of a Dhoti. We provide internal protection

for the handloom weaver and yet it will not be possible for him to take advantage of it because it is open to the mill industry to produce a dhoti without necessarily having coloured yarn on its border. This is what has occurred in many instances. It may be argued with some justification that it is impossible to bring within the confines of a legislative enactment the various definitions of a 'dhoti' or a 'sari'. But, I suggest that if we are to have any internal protection, we have to take into account not merely the interests of the handloom industry, but also the resistances that we have to meet from the consumer and find out ways and means of overcoming such resistances. We have been talking—some of us at any rate—of protecting the handloom industry and of giving it an assured market. We have been suggesting numerous restrictions being placed either on mills or mill-made goods. An eminent man in my state has suggested that these restrictions can be implemented by Government in a manner helpful to the handloom industry only if it is willing to incur the wrath of mill-owners. Now, this is not a question of displeasing mill-owners or pleasing the handloom weaver but the question of taking into account the interests of the mill industry as a whole, the consumers and the handloom weavers. If you do not take account of the economic position of the mill industry, the consumers' tastes and preferences which certainly tend to be eccentric, then all measures that we seek to introduce to benefit the handloom weaver will have their purpose defeated. I know, for instance, that as a result of this restriction order, there has not been any significant increase in employment of the handloom weavers; there has not been any significant increase in the prosperity of the handloom weavers in many of these regions. This by itself should give cause for serious thinking. I do not affirm for a moment that internal protection does not have its place in our economy. Of course, we must have internal protection: but, we also ought to see that the hand-

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

loom weaver takes advantage of this internal protection and produces goods which would give satisfaction to the consumer as well.

We have too long based policies on the hypothesis, Mr. Chairman, that the mill industry is something totally different from the handloom industry and is opposed to the interests of the handloom weavers. I, Sir, hold an entirely different view. In speaking thus I am not holding a brief for the mill-owner. I think the time has arrived when we should take advantage of the organisation of the mill industry for the purpose of promoting greater organisation among the handloom weavers. If along with internal protection, along with reservation of certain categories, we had concentrated on giving the mill industry a stake in promoting the prosperity of the handloom weavers, then undoubtedly there would have been witnessed a change in the position of the handloom weaver. This idea was broached by me once before on the floor of this House. I pleaded with the Government that the clothier system ought to be adopted by the mills and implemented so that the lot of the handloom weaver might be improved. We ought to pass a law whereby it would be obligatory on the part of our mills to allocate a proportion of their yarn to the handloom weavers, purchase finished goods and make themselves responsible for merchandising and other risks which are inherent in the purchase and sale of textile goods. The handloom weaver, as we know, Mr. Chairman, is very poor; he has no reserves to fall back on. Unless we have an organisation to bring these goods to the market, and sell them in the market, it would not be possible for the handloom weaver to benefit from internal protection. Internal protection would be of value only when the handloom weaver can take advantage of it. If we do not supplement this policy of internal protection without bringing about an organisation of handloom weavers,

then we would be making the rest of textiles to the consumer prohibitive and possibly make him change his preferences in favour of articles which do not enjoy protection.

After all the mill industry has an organisation and I do not see any reason why by law in a Welfare State we should not compel it to reserve a proportion of its yarn for the handloom weaver. Let yarn be given to the handloom weaver, let the finished product be obtained from him and let the mills be responsible for selling these goods in the market. This system may sound somewhat revolutionary to those who have not given sufficient thought to the problem of organisation of handloom weavers. After all, the handloom industry is in a bad state, not only financially but also organisationally. About 15 or 16 years ago, the proportion of master weavers to handloom weavers was in the ratio of 1:40. To-day it runs in the ratio of 1:200. If the mill industry could be compelled by law to take an interest, they would play a better role than the master weavers played in the past. I know that the new responsibilities which mills are compelled to shoulder would raise many many far-reaching issues, of a new labour policy for cottage industries which we would have to go into. So far as the handloom weavers are concerned, theirs is a cottage industry, and many of the provisions of the industrial disputes Act would have to be radically modified. The textile industry, let us not forget, consists not only of the mill industry but also of handloom weavers who have a notable part to play. I am not one of those who holds the view that the handloom weaver has no future in the new set-up. It might be true that for certain types or grades of handloom cloth, there is no future at all in the new set-up, but taking an overall view of the situation and taking into account the possibilities of improvement in the organisation of



weavers, I do suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there is a great chance of their playing a significant part in supplying the needs of the consumer. After all, the types of consumers to whom they cater would be quite different. People speak of improvements being effected in handloom designs. How is the improvement to come about unless there is a proper organisation of the handloom industry? I think that a new system of this type would give the Handloom weaver an opportunity of improving their designs. The mills would be able to study the tastes of consumers, set up a research organisation to improve the patterns of cloth manufactured by the handloom weaver, and spend money on having an assured market. The Handloom industry instead of being a weak and sickly thing would become healthy and what is termed as a 'desperate remedy' may eventually be the precursor of radical and sound measures. I know that when the Government introduced this order, it did so because there was a great outcry from many parts of the country, notably from the south, that the handloom weavers should be protected. Some amongst us thought that internal protection was an El Dorado which would work wonders for the handloom weaver. But today we are in a position to affirm that it has not worked wonders and will not work wonders unless internal protection is linked up with a variant of the clothier system. So far as this Bill is concerned, I should like to point out that it is a punitive measure which does, to a certain extent, hit hard those mills which have been producing cloth in excess of the quantities scheduled. Certainly when the mills are concentrated in one particular area, I should recommend enforcement of penal measures only as a last resort. I am aware that the Minister of Commerce and Industry in his opening speech pointed out that he did not wish to enter into the question of whether we were assisting the handloom industry or whether this measure had been sufficient for the purpose of protecting the handloom industry. He probably

was reluctant to have a wide debate on a question which might rove from the origins of our handloom industry to its present state of decadence. But I would like to point out that if we are going to have genuine assistance meted out to the handloom industry we must think of positive constructive measures which tend to put the handloom industry on its feet, which tends to give it a new organization and which gives it a new hope. That help will be given only if we bring about a better organization, and I cannot for myself see any better organisation than the mill industry for this purpose, and compelling it by law to play the role of a merchant and a provider of yarn to the handloom weavers. Probably, after two or three years of the new reform, we would be in a better position to realize how far internal protection allied to the clothier system works in our economy and probably this experience might be valuable for throwing a new light on the manner in which we can reconcile the small scale and large scale industries of our country.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wholeheartedly welcome this measure because this is a gesture of good will to the handloom industry and it also shows the continued interest and sympathy of the Government of India to the handloom industry. But that does not show that this Bill fully satisfies the needs of the handloom industry. Before I go into the Bill itself, I would like to ask for certain clarifications on certain important points. I have a copy of the executive order which has been passed in January, 1953, which has been issued by the Textile Commissioner, presumably under the direction of the Minister of Commerce and Industry. This order is issued under the Cotton Textiles (Control) Order, 1948. What I wish to know is, how was it possible for any mill to transgress the limits stated by that order. The Textile Commissioner, under the Textile Control Order, is clothed with enormous powers for enforcing his order. He has

[Shri S. V. Ramaswamy]

got the Central Excise Department also with him. And so far as I know, in Madras State the Central Excise officials are there in the mill itself. They are given an office and from day to day they check the quantity of production.

I do not know about Bengal or Bombay—whether these mills referred to in the Statement of Objects and Reasons have any connection with the mills in these States—but wherever they may be, I take it that the excise officials were also there, within the premises of the mills in Madras, and if that is so, how did they allow the mills to produce beyond the quota? I am not merely fighting for a technical point. If an executive order is passed and there are officers of the Government to see that the mills conform to those orders, how is it that these orders were disobeyed? The House is thankful to the hon. Minister for assuring the House that his Department did not wink at it. True enough, but how was it done? Did not the excise officials report to the superior authorities and say: "Here is a mill which is exceeding the limits set for it by that order." I also fail to understand why the Textile Commissioner, who is clothed with such enormous powers in that order, did not call those mills to order by launching prosecutions? The hon. Minister said they contemplated prosecutions, but they did not wish to take punitive measures. I do not know why. The orders of Government have got to be respected; they have got to be enforced. And they have got a department for enforcement also in the Textile Commissioner's office.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It has been abolished.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** I do not see why there has been a soft corner for those mill-owners who deliberately flouted the orders of the Textile

Commissioner. I hope the hon. Minister will explain how these lapses occurred; how the law of the land was not enforced in the case of mill-owners. I believe his explanation also will be satisfactory.

Now I come to the other point, Sir. The Statement of Objects and Reasons refers to the order passed with regard to the 60 per cent. of the production. It said that the production of dhoties is to be restricted to the production between April 1951 and March 1952. It is common knowledge, Sir, that that was the period when the mills were having peak production and as the hon. Minister himself admitted it was during this period that 50,000 bales were produced. When the executive order was passed that the production should be restricted to 60 per cent. of that peak period, it is common knowledge, Sir, that no benefit whatsoever was given to the handloom industry, because the enormous production was somewhere between 25,000 bales.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** May I, on a point of information, mention to the hon. Member who does not know apparently what has been happening, that prior to May 1952 Government insisted that 50 per cent. of the wide-width looms should be used for saris and dhoties only. While we are now attempting to restrict production there was a period when we insisted that there must be maximum production of saris and dhoties. Prior to May, 50 per cent. of the wide width looms had to produce saris and dhoties.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Nevertheless, Sir, I am correct in maintaining that this order did not confer any benefit upon the handloom industry, because the production was so high that even this restrictive order did not give any help to the handloom industry.

**Dr. M. M. Das:** For other reasons.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** That position stands quite correct and I am not wrong there.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** So you say!

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Now, the other point that I wish to urge is this. The Handloom Development Act which was passed in April 1953 gives powers to levy a cess on all cloth. I am reading Section 3. Sir:

“There shall be levied and collected on all cloth manufactured on or after the appointed day in the territories.....”.

When such powers were given by this Parliament and there was such a loud demand from the South particularly for the reservation itself of *dhoties* and *saris*, I do not know why the Ministry thought of passing this order restricting production only to *dhoties*. They could have taken advantage of the powers given by this Parliament under that Act and passed a similar order with respect to *saris* as well.

Why I am so earnest about this matter is this. From the Statistics of Monthly Abstract published by the Government of India I see that the position is somewhat peculiar. This is of August, 1953:

“*Dhoties* seem to be an inconsiderable part in the total production of the mills, compared to *sarees*”.

I shall stand corrected if I am wrong, but I assume that the column describing “coloured piecegoods” in the Monthly Abstract refers to *sarees*. Because, there is one column which says *Chaddhars*, another *Dhoties*, the third *Drills* and *Zins*, the fourth, *Shirting* and *Long cloth*, the fifth *Cloth domestic* and *Sheetings*, and the sixth is *Coloured Piecegoods*. I

take it it is this last category which represents *sarees*. I shall stand corrected if I am wrong.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** It refers to shirts.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** There is another separate category “*Shirting* and *Long cloth*”. I take it that even if this column does not refer entirely to *sarees* at least a major portion of these figures must refer to *sarees*.

Now, Sir, I shall take the figures that have been given for 1952 October, November and December. The total production of mills in October 1952 was 378.8 million yds. Of this 88.6 million is *dhoties* and 109.2 million refers to coloured piecegoods. In November 1952 the total production was 393.3 million yds. Of this 79.2 million refers to *dhoties* and 124.4 million refers to coloured piecegoods. In December 1952 the total production increased still further, and correspondingly coloured piecegoods also. The production increased up to 441.9 million yds. Of this 90.2 million is *dhoties* whereas coloured piecegoods went up to 134.8 million. The figures for *dhoties* and coloured piecegoods for 1953 are not available even in this latest volume of statistics.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** If the hon. Member wants details about the production of *dhoties* and *sarees*, I shall give them to him. Why does he offer surmises about figures which he does not understand?

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy:** Sir, may I continue?

**Mr. Chairman:** The hon. Member evidently wants more time. There is also no quorum in the House. I adjourn the House till 1-30 p.m. tomorrow.

*The House then adjourned till Half Past One of the Clock on Wednesday, the 25th November, 1953.*