

(2) Shri Digambar Singh, (3) Shri Vyankatrao Pirajirao Pawar and (4) Dr. Manik Chand Jatav-vir.

NATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION LIAISON COMMITTEE

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to inform the House that the election of Members to the National Food and Agriculture Organisation Liaison Committee will be held in Committee Room No. 62, First Floor, instead of room No. 21, Ground Floor, as announced on the 2nd April, 1953. The election will take place on the 10th April, 1953, between the hours of 1-30 P.M. and 4 P.M.

KHADI AND OTHER HANDLOOM INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT (ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTY ON CLOTH) BILL.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the Khadi Bill.

I would request the House to consider when possibly the discussion may be concluded. Rule 257 of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business says:

"Whenever the debate on any motion in connection with a Bill or on any other motion becomes unduly protracted....."

I do not say it is getting protracted—

".....the Speaker may, after taking the sense of the House, fix the hour at which the debate shall conclude."

We have already taken four hours and fifteen minutes on the last two days: first day two hours, another day two hours 15 minutes. When shall we close this debate? I would like to have the sense of the House. Now, we have started at 3-10. Shall we devote two hours more and close the first stage, that is the Consideration stage, at 5-10 or 5-15? Then we shall take it up clause by clause and finish the Bill today.

Some Hon. Members: By six o'clock.

Some Hon. Members: By seven o'clock.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members took an opportunity of discussing the entire question threadbare, everything relating to khadi and handloom. If hon. Members will confine their remarks to ten minutes each, and exactly to the suggestions that they have to make, accepting all that has been said

already, we can make it easier. Therefore, the first stage will be over at 5-15. Then we shall take it up clause by clause and finish the Bill before the close of the day. Or, if possible, earlier—we shall finish by six o'clock the third reading also.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I would also like to say that I would like to give an opportunity to hon. Members from those provinces which have not been represented so far, from this side or that. I shall call at random now. If hon. Members feel that a certain province has not been represented, I would like to give some representation to that province.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): May I request you, Sir, to give us an idea when the Finance Bill will be taken up—or that we shall not take up the Finance Bill today?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I said that the Consideration stage of; this Bill be over by 5-15. Then clause by clause consideration will be taken up. I do not know how long it will take. If it goes on till the end of the day, of course, the Finance Bill cannot be taken up today. If we finish earlier then we can take up the Finance Bill. It is in a fluid state now.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Is it not better, Sir, in regard to a measure like the Finance Bill to have some idea about when it is going to start? Today we may also take a decision whether we are going to sit on Saturday, which is not in the list supplied so far.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members, particularly Shri H. N. Mukerjee and other Leaders of various Groups met me in the Chamber and we decided that the Finance Bill must have four days. From whichever day it starts, that will go on for four days. If the Khadi Bill takes the whole of today—tomorrow is a non-official day, we are not meeting on the 11th and 12th, 13th is a holiday—the Finance Bill will be taken up on the 14th unless we have some spare time today in which it may be taken up. That is not possible. The Finance Bill will be taken up on the 14th. This Bill must be finished today; third reading also.

डा० एन० बी० खरे (ग्वालियर) :
मैं इस बिल का विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ

Shri T. N. Singh (Banaras Dist.—East): On a point of order, Sir,.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not going to hear the hon. Member. There is a point of order. He is not speaking from his seat.

डा० एन० बी० खरे: शायद मैं बोलता भी नहीं लेकिन एक मेरे सम्मानित कांग्रेसी मित्र हैं, कांग्रेस के मेम्बर हैं, बड़े ऊंचे स्थान पर हैं, उन्होंने ने मुझ से आप्रह किया कि मैं खादी पर जरूर बोलूँ और इस लिये मैं इस विषय पर बोलने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ, उन का नाम मैं नहीं बताऊंगा, क्योंकि उन पर सब तरफ से कांव कांव की वर्षा होने लगेगी....

एक माननीय सदस्य: नाम बता दीजिये।

डा० एन० बी० खरे: आप मुझे उस के लिये मजबूर नहीं कर सकते। इस में दो चीजें हैं, एक तो करघा उद्योग है और दूसरी खादी है। मैं करघा उद्योग का विरोधी नहीं हूँ, क्योंकि करघा उद्योग लाखों लोगों को पेट पालने का काम देता है और उस उद्योग को जितनी सहूलियत हम दे सकते हैं देनी चाहिये, यह मेरी राय और मत है, लेकिन मेरे दिल में एक शंका है कि इस बिल के द्वारा करघा उद्योग के ऊपर कोई खास अच्छा असर नहीं पड़ रहा है। मैं इस राय से जो जाहिर की गई, पूर्ण सहमत हूँ कि करघा उद्योग को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये और उसके लिये हमें बुनकरों को सस्ता और बारीक सूत सस्ते और मुनासिब दामों पर मुहैया करना चाहिये।

और भी कई चीजें इस दिशा में की जा सकती हैं, और मेरा उन से कोई विरोध नहीं है, लेकिन इस बिल में जो चीज है वह ज़रा अजीब सी मालूम होती है और वह चीज मैं आप को बतलाऊँ कि यह है कि जो मिल का बना कपड़ा है, उसके ऊपर एक पैसे प्रति गज के हिसाब से कर लगा कर इस तरह प्राप्त की हुई रकम से करघा उद्योग को मदद पहुंचाना यह चीज मुझे कुछ अजीब सी लगी। कारण कि

अगर मिल के कपड़े का मूल्य बढ़ गया तो पैसा तो ज्यादा पैदा हो जायेगा लेकिन जिस परिमाण में कीमत बढ़ जायेगी, उसी परिमाण में कपड़ा मंहगा होने के कारण कपड़े का बाज़ार भी मुकड़ जायेगा, इस लिये इस से जो हमारी मंशा है, वह पूरी नहीं हो पायेगी, ऐसा मेरा कहना है।

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

अब मैं खादी पर आता हूँ खादी का मतलब यह है कि हाथ से कती और हाथ से बुनी हुई चीज। खादी का जन्म, उस का विकास और उस का विनाश वह सारा इतिहास मेरी आंखों के सामने ताज़ा है। खादी की शुरुआत तो सन् १९२० में हुई और सन् १९२२ में यह प्रचलन में आई जब पूज्य बापू को ६ साल की कड़ी सज़ा हुई तो उन्होंने देशवासियों को यह सन्देश दिया था कि भाइयों और बहिनों सब खादी पहिना। और बहिनों को चरखा और तकली चलाने का गांधी जी ने संदेश दिया। उन का संदेश किसी अंश तक जनता ने माना, और किसी अंश तक नहीं माना लेकिन ताहम कांग्रेस में खादी का प्रचार हुआ और लोगों ने खादी को धारण किया और जिन लोगों के दिलों में देशभक्ति की भावना थी उन लोगों ने खादी पहिनी और खादी यद्यपि दूसरे कपड़े के मुकाबले में खराब और मंहगी पड़ती थी, तो भी लोगों ने खादी को देशभक्ति के नाते पहिना और तब स्थिति यह थी कि खादी एक देशभक्त की वर्दी थी, लेकिन अब आज स्थिति बदल गई है, अब खादी देशभक्ति की वर्दी नहीं रही है, अब खादी आज के दिन बहुत से ऐबों का जामा हो गई है (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : यह ठीक नहीं है।

डा० एन० बी० खरे : मुझे अधिकार है कि मैं जो ठीक समझू उस को हाउस के सामने रखूँ आप उस को मानें या न मानें, इस का आप को अधिकार अवश्य है। अब यह जो खादी है यह मानसिक दासता और ढोंगबाजी का जामा हो गई है और उस को वही लोग पहिनते हैं जो कांग्रेस के मेम्बर्स हैं और जिन को सरकार की इच्छा को पूरा करना और उन्हें लुप्त रखना होता है, आम जनता आज खादी को नहीं पहिनती, यह बात साफ है, क्योंकि अगर ऐसी स्थिति न होती तो फिर इस तरह का बिल ही आप यहां पर नहीं लाते।

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता था कि ...

Mr. Speaker: Let him speak. He is entitled to put forward his views. He will be replied to later on. Let us be tolerant and hear even the most carping criticism.

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : मैं आप से जो प्रार्थना करना चाहता था वह यह है कि मैं देखता हूँ कि आप भी खादी पहिने बैठे हैं और खादी के जामे को ढोंग बताना मैं समझता हूँ बड़ा भारी आक्षेप है और अनुचित एस्परसन है और इस तरह के शब्द प्रयुक्त नहीं होने चाहियें, जब कि स्वयं अध्यक्ष महोदय, उसी जामे में बैठे हुए हैं।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I think if an hon. Member exaggerates things and talks something which does not carry sense to a majority of the House or elsewhere, well, it is for him to consider as to how far he will be appreciated by this House. Let us not be intolerant about it.

डा० एन० बी० खरे : हज़ूर जब मैं आपना चित्त एकाग्र कर लेता हूँ और आंखें मीच कर खादी के बारे में चिन्तन करता तो मेरे सामने खादी

की एक मूर्ति अवतीर्ण होती है और वह मूर्ति कंसी होती है, टोपी तिरछी और नज़र तिरछी

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I may invite the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that here we are considering the economic aspect of the khadi industry. We are not concerned with the political aspect of the thing at all. The Bill, so far as I can see, is not intended to give a political push to khadi. It is conceived, as the aims and objects of the Bill show, for the purpose of giving some kind of relief and employment to large masses of people in our country. The hon. Member may criticise it from that point of view. He is entitled to hold differently. But, introducing the political aspects is not the proper mode of having his say. That is a different matter altogether. He need not enter into political wrangles.

डा० एन० बी० खरे : मेरा यह कहना है कि कल या परसों जब मंत्री महोदय ने इस विषयक को हाउस के सामने रक्खा था, तो उस समय यह बात साफ कर दी थी कि इस बिल में कोई पोलिटिकल बू नहीं है। मेरा उनूँके कहने में विश्वास नहीं है। इस वास्ते मेरा यह कहना है कि मुझे इस बिल में पोलिटिकल बू आती है, इस के लिये मैं क्या करूँ ? मुझे यह बात मंज़ूर है कि इस में पोलिटिकल बू नहीं आनी चाहिये, लेकिन वह जरूर आती है। जैसा आप की राय है इस में पोलिटिकल बू नहीं आनी चाहिये, इसे मैं मानता हूँ, इस में मेरा कोई मतभेद नहीं है, पर आती ही है तो क्या किया जाये ?

जहां तक खादी का सवाल है, वह आर्थिक समस्या तो ही नहीं सकती। और कोई आर्थिक सवाल होता तो शायद लाभदायक हो सकता था, लेकिन जहां तक खादी का प्रश्न है वह आर्थिक सवाल नहीं बन सकता क्योंकि यह तो बिल्कुल फेल हो गया है। यह आप सब जानते हैं। और शायद जानते हुए भी आप की

[डा० एन० बी० खरे]

मंशा है कि इस को मौका दिया जाये ? मैं कहता हूँ कि इस में पोलिटिकलवाद कैसे है। आप के इस सेस से जो पैसा वसूल होगा उस को किसी अंश में आप खादी के लिये देंगे, यानी चरखा संघ के हवाले करेंगे। अब आप देखिये कि चरखा संघ किस संस्था का अंग है ? कांग्रेस का। अगर चरखा संघ को मिल गया तो कांग्रेस को मिल गया। क्या इस में पोलिटिकल बात नहीं है। हमारे किसान से पैसा ले कर एक पार्टी का भला होता है इस को आप ध्यान में रखिये। मैं आप्रह करता हूँ कि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये।

इस के बाद क्या है ? आप जानते हैं कि खादी चली जा रही है। खादी और हाथ करघा के व्यवसाय में विरोध है। असल में आप दोनों को मदद पहुंचाते हैं। यह बिल पास कर के। यह कैसी अजीब सी बात है यह मेरे ध्यान में नहीं आती। जो लोग खादी पसन्द करते हैं वह हाथ करघे को पसन्द नहीं करते। यह वही लोग हैं जो ऊंचे स्तर के हैं और जो पोलिटिकल मतलब से उस को पहिन्ते हैं। उन की सहूलियत के लिये गरीब लोगों का और निम्न श्रेणी का, जो कि मिल का कपड़ा पहिन्ते हैं; कपड़ा क्यों महंगा किया जाये। जो लोग किसी भी कीमत पर खादी ले कर पहिन् सकते हैं उन के लिये क्यों गरीबों पर यह सेस लगाया जाय, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। इसलिये इस बिल से मेरा विरोध है।

दूसरी बात यह है कि इस से समाज में तीस वर्ष से जो वृत्ति पैदा हो गई है वह वृत्ति भी निन्दनीय है, ऐसा मेरा कहना है। यह वृत्ति अब नहीं होनी चाहिये। वह वृत्ति कैसे हो गई? मेरा यह कहना है कि खादी ने मानसिक दासता की वृत्ति इस देश में फैलाई, यह भी कारण है कि मैं इस बिल का विरोध करता हूँ। यह दासता की वृत्ति कैसे फैली यह मैं आप को बताता हूँ।

नित्यं चरखा तकली शिक्षा, सत्यमहिंसा विहिता दीक्षा।

लुंगी वसनम् कन्याशयनम्, दुग्ध सेवनम् कूर्चं वर्द्धनम्।

मा कुरु यत्नम् भज स्वराज्यम् वाइसरायम् भज स्वराज्यम्।

यह वृत्ति खादी ने कर दी है। मेरा इस वृत्ति से विरोध है और इस लिये मैं बिल का विरोध करता हूँ। मैं कहता हूँ कि खादी का कोई लाभ रहा नहीं, और यह खत्म हो गई। पूज्य बापू ने अब यह शून्य हो गया ऐसा महसूस किया था और अपने स्वयंसेवक का उन्होंने ने अक्टूबर, १९४७ को अपनी एक प्रार्थना सभा में इजहार भी किया था। ऐसा होते हुए भी, इस का जन्म हो गया, विकास हो गया और विनाश भी होने जा रहा है, तब भी आप इस में आर्टिफिशल लाइफ डालना चाहते हैं, उस को मरने दीजिये, खादी अब जीवित कहाँ है? अब स्पिनिंग में जीवन नहीं रहा है... आप इस को स्पिनिंग कहते हैं, मैं सिनिंग कहता हूँ पूज्य बापू जी की वर्षा आती है, उस में हमारे मुस्तलिफ मेम्बरान, मिनिस्टरान गवर्नरान आधे घंटे के लिये सूत कात कर के अपना प्रदर्शन करते हैं और अपनी ही हंसी उड़ाते हैं। मुझे इस को देख कर दुःख होता है, हालांकि मैं ऐसे विचारों का और आप के पक्ष का नहीं हूँ लेकिन लोग इस बात की खिल्ली उड़ायें, इस से मेरे दिल को बहुत दुःख होता है, आप चाहे इस को मानिये या न मानिये। इस दुःख को बढ़ाने के लिये आप क्यों इस बिल को प्रस्तुत करते हैं? इस को खत्म कर दीजिये। मेरी आप से इन शब्दों में प्रार्थना है कि जन गण मन दुःखदायक जय है, यह बिल पास न कीजे। मैं इतनी प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ हालांकि यह मेरा दुर्भाग्य है कि यह मेरी प्रार्थना वैसी होगी जैसे कि अरण्य रुदन होता है; किसी कवि ने कहा है :

अरण्यरुदितम् कृतम् शवशरीरमुपोषितम्,
वृत्तान्धमुख दर्पणो यदबुधो जनः सेवितः

इस लिये मैं यहाँ पर यदि कुछ कहूँ तो वह अरण्य रू न ही होगा, मेरी बात मानी नहीं जायगी। इस की जह यह है कि देखता हूँ कि शुभ्र और शुद्ध खादी पहिने हुए लोग बैठे हुए हैं और कई सदस्य तो मुझे ऐसे लगते हैं जैसे चांदी के पिंजरे में सोने की चिड़िया बन्द हो। इस लिये इस का कोई असर नहीं होगा।

Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati): Sir, I have not been able to participate in the discussions for a long time now. I am extremely glad that you have come back, and I hope I will have greater relief so that I may speak here after for longer times in the House.

I have been provoked to get up after having heard the speech of my good old friend.....

Dr. N. B. Khare: Thank you.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar:.....Dr. Khare. We came into the Assembly in 1934 together. He was also at the outset one of the lovers of Khadi, but since then, I am sorry, he has somewhat become bitter.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Bitterest enemy.

Mr. Speaker: Let him proceed.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: And therefore, it is that he sees much in Khadi which is not really there—no politics, nothing whatever. Whatever Dr. Khare might say, it is not on account of politics or on account of any *vesha* as he said that we support Khadi, but because we sincerely and honestly believe that khadi and handloom alone can revive our economy in this country.

I myself in a humble way started a depot for production as early as 1920, and also a depot for the sale of khadi. A number of friends who were interested in the handloom industry started this. It so happened in a very short time when once we took to distributing cotton in slivers—every week there was a *shandy* in our place—a number of people would come forward to take the slivers from us and return yarn the next week. We

would collect this yarn and then distribute it on the *shandy* or market day to various weavers. They would return it in the form of cloth next week. This practice of advancing cotton slivers and yarn is going on in various places in my part of the country even now, though I cannot speak with authority with respect to other parts of the country. The villagers want some kind of secondary occupation and the wherewithal to purchase some of those articles for which they come to the *shandy* on the market day once a week to supplement their meagre resources at home. Even today if this is taken up on hand and followed, and various centres started and the All-India Spinners' Association given encouragement and help, I am sure we will all become Khadi-minded. We started with the spirit of *Swadeshi*, and why should we lose that spirit today?

The plight of handloom weavers is miserable. There are many of them. In my district, there are 22,000. At the rate of five members per family, it comes to a lakh of persons in my district to be maintained and protected by handloom weaving alone. We are denying them the comforts of life. Some of our friends here state that if handloom is encouraged, some of the mills may go out of production, but I would only urge upon those in charge of mills to produce for purposes of export. Hitherto we have been exporting only raw producis. After partition, we are not able to get sufficient quantity of cotton which we used to get from the Punjab. For feeding the Ahmedabad mills, we are importing cotton to the tune of Rs. 80 to 90 crores from Egypt and other places. Let finer varieties of cotton be obtained by import. Let us produce sufficient for export markets, and let us capture the markets round about—Burma and other places on this side to the right, and to the left. They do not produce cotton textiles. They have to depend upon us. Even Australia is depending to a large extent upon our textiles. I know Messrs. Binny and Co. produce a variety of cloth which is being sent to Australia for sale. Even to England, particular varieties of cloth are being sent. Now, therefore, if it is possible to make an arrangement that the mills shall produce such varieties as will find a market outside, and at any rate reserve the *dhoties* and *sarees* for this handloom industry, then the handloom industry will flourish. Actually we are producing very fine varieties out of handloom. There were exhibitions organised all over the country, as for instance, the khadi-exhibition organised under the auspices

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

of the All India Spinners' Association, whenever a Congress was held or even at other times; after seeing the exhibits every one used to wonder whether such beautiful articles could be produced in handloom. When we go to other countries and see what people wear, we find that it is all plain thing. They are not able to get such fine varieties. I along with a lady Member of this House had been to America recently, and when she was passing in the streets, every one used to catch hold of her saree and ask 'Where did you get this saree? Is it a single piece?' and so on. Every one used to wonder how we are able to produce such fine sarees, whether 18 cubits or six yards, and used to ask 'Is it a single piece?'. In Arni, the place from where I come, there are sarees costing Rs. 150 or Rs. 200, and so on. So much so, I thought that if I had only carried about 10 to 15 sarees, I could have easily met the passage expenses.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): Not wearing them?

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: Unfortunately, I could not wear them. Therefore, this is an indigenous industry which has to be encouraged. I am told that in Assam no lady will get a husband, unless she is able to weave. I am sure they must have become experts in that now. The largest number of handlooms is in Assam. Next only to Assam, we have the largest number of handloom weavers in Madras.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): Madras has the highest number.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: My hon. friend comes from Salem, and I am glad to be corrected. Originally I thought that Assam had the largest number. In Salem, the whole town depends upon this handloom industry. It is only a meagre help that is being given, and let us not grudge it. I would urge upon the hon. Minister to see to it that somehow the textile industry accepts this that so far as *dhories* and *sarees* are concerned they shall be reserved only for handloom and nothing else, and that they shall not be produced in any shape or form for purposes of use inside the country, by the mills.

Some objection has been taken to this, on the ground that the handloom products will be costly whereas cheaper varieties ought to be produced, which the poorer section of the people may be able to wear. They are making small bargains, who talk

in that strain because the cloth which is produced in the mill wears out much easily and earlier also, than cloth which is produced in handloom, which lasts longer, and which is therefore able to benefit the consumer in the long run. Even if one has to pay the same price, it is worthwhile to pay that price in order to keep these other people in employment.

These are the two points which I wanted to urge upon all sections of the House. There ought to be no politics in this. My hon. friend unfortunately smells politics everywhere. There are no politics in this. It is purely an economic issue for reviving and rehabilitating those struggling brothers of ours and also to put ourselves on an economic basis. It will also enable us to improve the balance of payments, which, unfortunately, we are not able to make by various other processes.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Khancheepuram): I like the Deputy-Speaker, happen to come from a constituency which has experienced great hardships, and which has been the witness of great suffering in the community of handloom weavers.

An Hon. Member: What are you wearing?

Dr. Krishnaswami: I should like this House to consider this question from an essentially human point of view; there are millions of our countrymen who have been leading stunted lives for the past decade. Is this Bill calculated to put the handloom industry on its feet or does it give the impression of appearing to help the handloom weaver, without actually helping him? In the areas in which handloom weavers live, the prosperity of the areas is bound up with the prosperity of this section of our society. Indeed, the problem of depressed areas in our country is the problem of handloom weavers.

I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry as to what exactly he intends to do for the handloom weavers. We are told that Government intend collecting about rupees five to six crores by levying cess duty on mill-cloth. This amount is to be utilised for furthering the interests of khadi and handloom. I am sure that all of us realise that there is a vital distinction between khadi craft and handloom industry. Khadi is handspun and hand-woven, while handloom goods are mill-spun and hand-woven. This is

a crucial difference which we have to bear in mind, and I should like to place before the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry not merely the economic aspects of the question of khadi, but also the difficulty of making it a solvent industry either in the near or in the foreseeable future. So far as the handloom industry is concerned, it is possible by regulatory devices, and by financial assistance, to put it on its own feet. But it is impossible to resurrect khadi. This is the conclusion not of those who are politically opposed to khadi, but of lovers of khadi. Writing in the *Harijan* in 1950 only about two years ago, in a symposium which was devoted particularly to the elucidation of the various facts of khadi problem, a great critic endowed with great analytic ability and subtlety of expression pointed out that khadi could not be an economically profitable proposition, that even if it were encouraged by the State with liberal grants, it could not survive in this harsh world of change and varying tastes. The writer of that article was no less an individual than the hon. Dr. Kailas Nath Katju, now Home Minister of the Union Government, who made the additional point disconcerting to lovers of khadi, that it would continue to be a sweated industry. If in spite of such unimpeachable testimony my hon. friends are anxious to remain unconvinced, they are welcome to live in a world where reason does not penetrate and blind faith guides and sustains.

But my objection is that this industry should not be subsidised out of public funds, because obviously when once you subsidise it out of public funds, we would like to know whether in the near or in the foreseeable future, there would be a return to society. The problem of handloom weavers is different, because apart from there being a large number of these unfortunate men concentrated in many regions, there is also a distinct probability of this industry surviving and contributing its quota to national income and prosperity. What does this Bill seek to achieve? We would have a pittance of about Rs. six crores or thereabouts realised from the cess, for the purpose of assisting both the handloom and the khadi industry. We have, I believe, about three million handlooms in our country. Three million handlooms sustain about eighteen millions of the population in our country. And if we apportion the amount on a per capita basis we would be in a position to give only about Rs.20 a year or thereabouts to each handloom. The price

disparity between handloom and mill products is much greater and much larger than many of my friends are inclined to imagine; and Rs. 20 a year would be totally grossly inadequate for narrowing the price dispersion between handloom and mill products.

Moreover, it ought to be clear to the Government that if the handloom industry is to be helped in any appreciable degree facilities should be provided in the shape of abundant, cheap and subsidised yarn, and in shape of new marketing methods. Can it be reasonably imagined that this pittance which is to be devoted for the purpose of benefiting the handloom and khadi industry, will in any degree, appreciably affect the fortunes of that industry? I have grave doubts on this matter. But let me proceed with an analysis of the long run problems that face the handloom industry, because I yet have hopes that the Government will even at this late hour devote their attention afresh to the solution of the difficulties that beset this neglected industry.

The problems that face the handloom industry are twofold in character. There is the long run problem of yarn shortage; the weaver is not employed for more than ten days in the month as he cannot obtain enough yarn for a month; there is also the problem of organisation of the handloom industry. The handloom industry is today a disorganised industry, and during the past few years it has become more and more disorganised. As long ago as 1924 or thereabouts, the first Taxation Inquiry Committee in its report indicated that the composite mills—the spinning and weaving mills—had increased relatively to the spinning mills. What was the significance of this trend? The composite mills found it cheaper to utilise the yarn, and the handloom weaver was faced with a diminution in supply of raw material. This conclusion receives further corroboration from the Fact-Finding Commission on the handloom industry which in its report presents illuminating figures of yarn supplied to weavers. I would, therefore, ask the hon. Minister to consider the advisability of setting up spinning mills in those centres where handloom weavers are concentrated for the purpose of giving them yarn at fairly subsidised rates. Certainly this Bill does not make any provision for giving yarn to handloom weavers at subsidised rates and even if it be held that this is the intention of Government the amount that is available is hardly sufficient for this purpose. But what is the problem of organisa-

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

tion of weavers which is hinted at and which ought to be taken note of seriously by the Government? I venture to suggest that unless we attend to this problem all schemes of protection, all schemes of internal regulation will be of little or no avail.

I do think that a fresh approach should be made. In the United Kingdom, round about the 18th and 17th Centuries there was what was known as the system of 'clothiers' who undertook the responsibility of buying yarn and of selling the finished articles in the market, thus minimising the risks of merchandising and sale. Is it not possible in our country to insist that all or selected mills should devote a certain proportion of their spinning capacity for furnishing yarn to the handloom weavers, and should advance them credit and other facilities, and take upon themselves the responsibility of selling handloom goods. We must compel them by law to perform these duties which apart from being socially beneficial would also be profitable. One of the difficulties of the handloom weaver not to be minimised is that of selling his goods at profitable prices. The handloom weaver lives from hand to mouth and he does not have the reserves to wait, and sell when prices are high. Therefore, what happens, what occurs in most centres, is distress selling. Continuous distress selling partly explains the reason for many of the areas which once hummed with activity being today centres of depression and social misery.

Certain important changes have occurred in the constitution of the handloom industry, changes which are obvious but which we have chosen conveniently all of us, Government and legislators to slur over. Fifteen years, the handloom industry was relatively speaking in a state of better organisation; it was in some respects a normal industry. We had a larger proportion of 'master weavers' to handloom weavers and this class of skilled craftsmen gave an impetus to standardisation and durable production of handloom goods like sarees and dhoties. Today we are witnessing an influx of new entrants into this industry, new entrants who have been displaced from agriculture and who with little capital and skill are creating a new social problem. We are witnessing even as in the case of land a pressure of population on the handloom industry. Now this development only emphasises the

need for the state actively promoting radical measures to achieve the organisation of this industry. If the Government could by law insist on the mills, playing a role similar to that of the clothiers in the United Kingdom, the impetus to re-organisation of this industry would be given. An organised handloom industry would, no doubt, lead to fewer new entrants entering into the industry and at the same time have the beneficial effect of standardising products and creating a new markets. It would be in the interest of the new clothiers to see to it that products are improved and to see also that the yarn is supplied to weavers at subsidised rates. I do not suggest that it should be the responsibility only of the mills. By all means, let us have co-operative mills started in different centres, certainly in those centres where there are numerous handloom weavers so that they might be given an opportunity of not only obtaining yarn at cheap and subsidised prices but also of selling these commodities at very cheap rates.

A reference was made to the question of protection. Now, on protection it is possible to have diverse views. The Planning Commission which went into this subject did not examine this question at length since it feels that it is better to await the Textile Expert Committee's findings on the cotton industry. Internal protection is a more serious and delicate matter than protection against imports. But I do feel that there is much to be said in favour of internal protection. The Madras Legislative Assembly, a composite Assembly, unanimously passed a resolution demanding internal protection for handloom goods. I suggest that once we organise the handloom industry through indigenous 'clothiers' it would be possible to view internal protection in a favourable light. The main argument against granting of internal protection is that there would be room for evasion, particularly in the case of textiles. Your Tariff Board cannot decree that sarees should not be produced. What is a saree? You can only lay down that cloths of certain width should be banned—that certain widths should not be produced by the mills. But there are ways of circumventing this order, and the handloom industry would not obtain any benefit. There is also a social problem which has to be taken into account. What is the price that you can afford to pay for unemployment in the urban region? How far can

we afford to encourage low productivity, and greater employment in the rural sector? A third and more vital factor which has to be taken into account is the taste of the consumer. The tastes of the consumer are eccentric and he may not choose to buy these very goods designed to be protected. These are formidable arguments against the granting of internal protection. But if you once create a 'clothier' interest in the production of these handloom goods, then it might be possible to have a dose of internal protection because the mills—the co-operative mills and the other mills—would have a vested interest or a stake in seeing to it that the handloom goods are improved, and internal protection is not evaded. It is probable that once we have an organised handloom industry, new markets would be created. All tastes are not natural. Some tastes are created and more tastes are created by advertisement than are realised by administrators who talk flippantly and think little on this question. Therefore, I suggest that by this sort of organisation it would be quite possible and natural for us to create new markets and to give a real sense of assurance and stability to the handloom weaver. We need not necessarily sacrifice the textile industrial capacity of our country. We would at the same have given an impetus to the organisation what I would call a very large region of our countryside and making the handloom weavers prosperous; the depressed areas would cease to be depressed. There has been too little attention paid to the question of increasing the income of depressed areas of many parts of our country. But it is quite probable that if we devote our immediate attention towards organisation of the handloom industry on these lines, not only would we increase the incomes of weavers; we would also have an opportunity of improving the handloom industry and thus witnessing a flow of variegated products over which Mr. Deputy-Speaker rightly waxed eloquent, only a few minutes ago. The consumers' tastes would be interfered with to a minimum extent and the producers of mill goods would not regret assistance being given to the weaver. The handloom weavers, the millions who depend on the handloom for their sustenance, would have an assured existence.

Of course, the re-organisation of this industry would lead in the future to more rigid standards being laid down for entry into the handloom vocation. Those standards would be laid down not by officials or co-operatives; they would come into being as

a result of the exercise of the clothiers' function and the tastes of the consumers—many of which would be created. The right of entry into the new handloom industry would be much stricter but that I need not consider to be a disadvantage because, after all, unrestricted entry in the case of many occupations spells disaster. I would, therefore, earnestly appeal to the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry to apply his mind afresh to this question and consider the problems from a more serious and far-reaching angle. Today, however, what we are doing in this Bill—to put it in very bald language—is to levy a tax on technical improvement for tinkering with this problem. Without attending to the major problems facing this industry, without changing our angle of vision on the role which the handloom industry is expected to play in the Welfare State of the future, how is it possible for us to believe that you are sincere and that this Bill is not an eye wash, a poor thing of little or no value to society?

Prof. S. N. Mishra (Darbhanga North): Coming as I do from an area which is famous all over India for khadi production, I think, I can claim to have a vital interest in the matter. Sir, you, as a very staunch believer in khadi, and, probably, as one who has been wearing khadi for more years than many of us here, must be knowing about the famous centre to which I want to refer, the Madhubani-Khadi centre, which is well known as a great institution of khadi in the whole of India. In my part of the country, khadi means not only cloth but also bread, education to children and medical facilities to thousands of workers who are employed in the production of khadi. Many of the workers have almost dedicated their lives to the cause of khadi. I have had the privilege to work with them and I can say that no country in the world can boast of a band of workers with such a fine calibre, integrity and a spirit of dedication to the cause as these men. But, what is happening to them, at the present moment? Only a few months back, I had an opportunity to go and meet them and I found that many of these workers were being retrenched. Most of their stocks were lying unsold because of lack of consumption or indifference on the part of Government. So, when this Bill comes before the House, it is with a sense of peculiar satisfaction and a certain amount of pleasure that I welcome it. But, I must at the same time, say that this Bill is only

[Prof. S. N. Mishra]

a half-hearted measure and the amount of help that is being sought to be given through this Bill would not be going a long way in helping this kind of cottage industry or, for that matter, the khadi production in the country.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

For some time I have been wondering what has happened to us and particularly to those of us in the Government, that khadi has not been receiving its due at the hands of our Government; why has khadi been given a raw deal, if I may call it a deal at all? In my opinion, after the attainment of independence, the highest national priority should have been given to the production of khadi or to the cottage industry. Look at new China. When I consider the conditions of new China, I am a little surprised about the attitude taken by some of my hon. friends on the opposite side. In the new China—most of the experts and economists who had been there say that—cottage and small scale industries have a more prominent part to play in the economy than large scale ones. You know that during the days of political struggle or during economic turmoils, cottage industry and handicrafts in that country, had to play a very large part. So, when the new regime came into power, they took care to see that cottage industries were properly protected and encouraged. Therefore, we find, at the present moment, a great result achieved in the sphere of cottage industry. The Nanking Brocade, which is very famous in China and which was almost at the point of extinction, now, due to the encouragement given by the Government, is being exported to Sinkiang and to other countries. This is how cottage industries are being encouraged in the Communist regime. So, I was wondering a little why after the attainment of independence, khadi did not have its rightful place in the economic configuration of the country, why Government was not giving it the deal which should have been given. For most of us, khadi is the mother of independence. But, I would not, for a moment, like to countenance the idea that the Government should look upon encouragement to khadi as a sort of widow's maintenance after the death of the Father of the Nation. I would not also like that Government should approach khadi or cottage industry in a spirit of condescension, in a spirit of patronisation. It is a hard economic reality that should impel the

Government to come forward and help the cottage industry. There is now a clear question posed before the country and that question is now assuming a very menacing proportion to which probably most of the speeches during the budget discussion were directed. I refer to the problem of unemployment in the country and the menacing proportions it is assuming. What has the Government to offer by way of remedying this situation? According to the experts, we have an account of how many workers would be added to the total working population during the next five years. According to the estimate, there would be about 70 lakhs of workers added to our total working force. According to their estimate, again for one person to be employed in a sort of non-farm occupation, it would cost 2,500 dollars. So far the employment of 70 lakhs workers the required investment would come up to Rs. 8,750 crores. Over and above this, for agricultural development, four per cent. of the national income would have to be invested in the sphere of agriculture. That will come up to Rs. 1,800 crores. So, the total amount required would be about Rs. 10,550 crores—indeed, a huge amount for getting these 70 lakhs of workers who would be added to our total working people employed in some non-farm occupations. That means that about 23 per cent. of our national income would have to be invested for getting these persons employed. Now, it is clear that in this way a very huge amount of resources would be required to give employment to these people.

I ask a clear question, in the background of all this. Would the Government be able to provide so much of resources for investment for giving employment to these people? If the Government cannot do that, the only alternative is that they have to take recourse to cottage industry. They have to encourage khadi. Khadi is the central star in the constellation of the cottage industry to which our Government will be well advised to hitch its wagon to give employment to the people. Otherwise, there is no remedy. It is no use the hon. Minister coming forward and saying that it is atavism to think that khadi or cottage industry will solve the problem. I think that most of those persons who think on that line require a seminar for understanding the real problems that unfortunate millions in the remote of countryside have to suffer. The Government spokesman says that it is an attends of ataviam.

No. it is an attitude to real economic thinking that impels us to say that it is only by encouragement of khadi, by encouragement of cottage industry that the worsening unemployment situation can be solved. It is in that perspective that I would like the whole question to be considered. So far as our present pattern of taxation is concerned, so far as our refusal to adhere to an austerity programme is concerned, so far as our refusal also to curtail our consumption is concerned, it does not seem to be possible, at any rate, that we are going to have that much of finance. But, when I think of that I feel that if during the war years—I mean the last war—the British Government could collect about 5,000 crores of rupees for the prosecution of war, why should our Government in this battle against poverty be pusillanimous and lose heart that they cannot collect at least the requisite amount for solving the unemployment problem in the country. I am definitely of opinion that only at a war level can the problems of unemployment and poverty be tackled. On no other level can any Government solve this problem of unemployment in the proportion in which it exists in India. In my States, recently there were 1300 vacancies in the Transport Department and nearly 64,000 applications were received, and even graduates and M.As. had applied for the posts of chauffeurs. From this you can understand how this problem is becoming graver day by day and how the educated unemployed constitute a grave danger to our future.

4 P.M.

It seems the Government have become the casualty of some sort of economic sophistication, which I am unable to understand. They always talk of striking a balance between large scale and cottage industries. We also stand for that. There must be a balance. That is the attitude of the Planning Commission also. But there cannot be any conflict between large scale and cottage industries so long as there is a great demand for consumer goods. The conflict can only arise when the total production exceeds the total demand. That stage has not been reached. So, while the conflict may be inherent and may be precipitated at a later stage, there is no question of its arising at the present moment. All of us are pledged to a sort of economic life which would not be based on exploitation or acquisitive instinct. We value the *charkha* more than anything else, for we believe in a society of producers

and not of exploiters. So a different approach to the whole problem has to be adopted.

Think of the huge wastage of manpower resources at the present moment. According to Dr. B. P. Adarkar, nearly Rs. 1,000 crores worth of wealth is annually being wasted even at the present level of efficiency and productivity. If the level of efficiency can be pitched up, a lot of such wastage can be saved. In view of all this, I think that more encouragement should have been given to khadi and cottage industries. Look at the tragedy of the whole thing. About Rs. three crores and 30 lakhs were deposited with the Industrial Finance Corporation by the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi and all that money, I am told, has been invested in big industries and not for helping khadi or cottage industries.

Shri Sarangadhar Das (Dhenkanal—West Cuttack): What has Government to do with the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi?

Shri Gidwani (Thana): Yes, what has Government got to do with it?

Prof. S. N. Mishra: Do you think that the Government cannot give advice to the Industrial Finance Corporation in regard to the general industrial pattern?

Shri Gidwani: But how does the Nidhi come in there?

Prof. S. N. Mishra: Ultimately, the whole responsibility for the industrial advancement of the country rests with the Government and it can make its suggestions if it is so minded.

I want to have clear answers to some other urgent and important questions on which Khadi and cottage industries have a bearing. For instance, what would you do to increase the purchasing power of the cultivators if you are not going to give them supplementary occupations like cottage industries? At present, the level of their purchasing power is so very low that it is causing grave anxiety. Government should do something more expeditiously to increase it. Another point is the pressure on land. Unless this pressure is relieved, there can be no question of making agriculture an economic proposition in India. Here also, it can be done only by encouraging cottage industries and providing the cultivators with supplementary occupations. According to certain estimates, the number of men engaged in cottage industries are five-

[Prof. S. N. Mishra]

times more than those who are engaged in factories and organised industries. These people are gradually fading out and are on the point of extinction due to lack of proper support. In view of this, Khadi and other cottage industries should have been given a higher importance and priority than has been given to them at present.

One question has been raised, which is purely academic or theoretical, namely, that Khadi and cottage industries lack inner or inherent strength. I do not see how it lies in the mouth of big industries to say so. Actually, jute, coal, textiles, sugar, steel and several other industries have depended upon a very sympathetic attitude of the Government and have prospered at a great sacrifice of the community in regard to raw materials, industrial relations, price fixation etc. In fact, the very breath of their existence is dependent upon the mercy of the Government in every one of the many respects I have referred to. If Khadi or cottage industries did not possess inherent strength, how could they have survived all the ordeals, stresses and even governmental indifference for so long? So, there can be no question of their lacking in inherent strength.

I would like to make a few suggestions. One is that in regard to Khadi, Government should evolve a national target for the remaining three years of the Five Year Plan, and I suggest that the most modest target would be 15 crore sq. yards. At the present moment, Khadi production has progressively deteriorated due to Governmental indifference. In 1941-42 when production was at its peak, some 3.2 crore sq. yards were produced, but today the production stands at only two crore sq. yards. If we want to leaven up production, it can be done only by fixing a target and assiduously adhering to it.

Many other suggestions have been made by other hon. Members and I would not like to repeat them. I would only say that for encouraging Khadi or cottage industries on a large scale, you should effect far-reaching changes in the educational, industrial, fiscal, export-import and transport policies. When I refer to educational change, I mean the basic education. Without the spread of basic education, there can be no proper encouragement to khadi. In my State the spread of basic education has clearly demonstrated that there

is a substantial change in the psychology of the people and consequently an encouragement to cultivation and spinning in the area. Therefore, the spread of basic education should be associated with the solution of this problem. Then I come to the transport policy. By transport policy I mean that in the matter of freight there should be concessions granted to the cottage industries and unless that concession is granted, it would be very difficult for the cottage industries to compete with mill-made products. So far as outlet of increased production or marketing is concerned, there are two or three avenues. One avenue has been very properly emphasised by other speakers: that Government should take to purchase of khadi and handloom products where suitable for its entire textile needs. I also join those hon. Members in making this demand, but if there is found to be any difficulty in doing that—there may be certain difficulties, I can appreciate—it should be discussed threadbare in all its aspects and a reasonable conclusion arrived at. There are two other avenues which should be explored. One is giving Khadi a prestige value in the community, and unless we give it a prestige value in the community khadi does not stand much chance. How can we do that? Government can ask its officers to take to khadi. No officer in the Government of India or in the States should wear anything except khadi or handloom products. That would give khadi an economic assistance; that would give it a prestige value. If the Government takes to it seriously, I think there would be a change in the psychology of the Government officers and they would voluntarily take to it. After all we did not force anybody to wear khadi some time back; but there was a change in the atmosphere and it had an effect on the minds of the people.

Another means is to create a market for it on the self-sufficiency basis. For that Government will have to give encouragement to the people in the countryside by the provision of training facilities, supply of raw materials, supply of improved seeds and technical assistance. In this connection I would like to remind you that when Mahatmaji was alive he had experimented with a scheme of yarn-exchange at Wardha. It has been working in Ambala in the Punjab. That is a very good experiment to which our attention should be directed.

Since I have not much time I would end by saying that Government in pursuance of the spirit of this Bill should also take further steps to encourage other cottage industries. Take for instance the oil industry. There should be a cess on the oil mills. For that purpose probably a recommendation has been made by the Planning Commission also. If there is a cess of about three pies per pound on the oil seeds crushed in the mills, it would give us about Rs. four crores. In the same way for the protection of the ghee industry..

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are all these relevant? This Bill relates only to khadi and other handloom industries. Is ghee a handloom industry?

Prof. S. N. Mishra: Obviously it is not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is no good straying away from the point.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: What I mean is that in pursuance of the spirit of this Bill of Government giving encouragement to khadi and handloom industry, further steps should be taken to protect and encourage other cottage industries. For that my suggestion is that there should be a cess on the oil seeds crushed in the mills and if we levy a cess of three pies per pound we will get Rs. four crores.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that is irrelevant. There are a number of other cottage industries with respect to each one of which we can go into a discussion.

Prof. S. N. Mishra: In conclusion I shall only submit that there cannot be vigorous economic growth in the country unless something is done by the Government to bring about the economic regeneration of the villages and that can only be done by giving more encouragement to cottage industries, particularly khadi and handloom industry. So this is a very welcome measure. It is a step in the right direction. But this step is not enough and more steps should be taken by the Government. With these words I welcome this measure not for its adequacy, but for its being a step in the right direction.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Gurupadaswamy Hon. Members will have ten minutes each.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): This Bill has produced mixed feelings in my mind, because when I look at the policy of Government and the attitude of the Commerce and

Industry Ministry with regard to the handloom and cottage industries, I rather doubt whether they are serious at all to develop these industries. As a result of long and continued agitation both by the public as well as in the Press, the hon. Commerce and Industry Minister has brought forward this Bill. If the Bill is meant as a machiavellian device to white wash, or hoodwink the public, then it is not necessary for us to be called to support this Bill at all. On the other hand, if the Bill is meant genuinely to protect and develop this industry and if it is also meant as one of the first steps to rehabilitate this industry, then all sections of the House should unreservedly support this Bill. So, before we support or oppose this Bill we want to have a clear enunciation of the policy of the Government.

As I said there is a sort of lukewarm attitude pursued by the Government—that the handloom and cottage industries are not indispensable to the economy of the country. It is a dangerous attitude. It will produce devastating effects on the entire economy of the country. Some hon. Members opposed the Bill on the ground that khadi or handloom production will not be an economic proposition. That is not the way of looking at these industries; that approach is not correct. The way we should look at these industries is that whether they provide employment to millions of people whose plight is progressively deteriorating. Today, as you know, all the advanced and progressive economists have agreed that the problem of unemployment is the leading economic question of the age and particularly in India this matter has become complicated due to the seasonal nature of employment in agriculture. So, if the Government wants to follow a "full policy of full employment", as has been envisaged by Sir William Beveridge, which can be adopted here also, then we must support all measures of Government which tend to increase avenues of employment to millions of people. From other angles also I support a measure of this kind. We cannot solve the economic problem of the country by centralising the industries in a few areas. If we want regional distribution of industries and, further, if we want equitable distribution of the proceeds of the industries, then we must support the development of handloom and khadi industries, and any other cottage industries for that matter. So from these angles alone we must look at this Bill. And I want every hon. Member of this

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

House to make up his mind not to consider this Bill from a mere abstract economic standpoint. That is dangerous. There is something more important involved, namely the human consideration which should have precedence over economic consideration. That aspect, as I told you, is to provide employment to millions of people.

After saying this I want to come to the problems facing this industry. Many hon. Members have already spoken about the various difficulties. From my point of view, the main difficulties can be categorised into three groups. Firstly, this industry is suffering from lack of finance. Secondly, it is suffering from lack of technical assistance. Thirdly, it is suffering from lack of marketing organisation. The problem of finance is a difficult one. Many of our workmen who are engaged in this industry cannot raise a loan or get any financial help from either banks or co-operative societies or from the Government. So they are not able to purchase the raw materials, stock them, and hold on to the finished products till they get better prices. It is very necessary therefore that credit facilities should be made available to the artisans. Unless the artisans are helped in this way the middlemen will exploit the situation and they will profit by the labours of the artisans. That should not be allowed.

The second problem, as I said, is the problem of technical assistance. This is a vital problem. If you want to develop the industry on modern and economic lines you must render technical help to the artisans. Implements of the hoary past are still continued to be used for the production of these goods. If that sort of thing is continued for long the industry may collapse economically, and however much we try to provide artificial respiration to this industry it may die. So I want a very thorough inquiry into this problem of technical assistance. This problem cannot be solved by the artisans themselves because, as I said, the resources at the disposal of the artisans are very limited. Only the State can solve this problem. I want the Government to come forward with a scheme to help this industry with technical advice.

The third problem, as I pointed out, is marketing. That is also a very vital question. It is very easy to produce goods, but it is very difficult to

find markets for them. Unless the markets are expanded and unless we create a condition that the goods produced by this industry are marketed and sold quickly, we cannot think of developing this industry and this industry will have no future. So, one of the essential conditions for the development of this industry is to provide adequate market for its goods. And with a view to expand the market, I make one or two suggestions.

The first is we are having a number of *shandies*, village fairs, spread out all over India. They are unfortunately disappearing today due to lack of encouragement. Villagers, instead of going to the *shandies* or fairs, are going to the cities and towns for purchasing their requirements. This tendency should be counteracted and encouragement should be given by all means to spread the organisation of fairs in villages. If we encourage the holding of fairs and *shandies* in the rural parts we will be automatically creating markets for the goods that are produced in those areas. This problem has not received the attention of either the Central Government or the Provincial Governments, so far. They have completely neglected this aspect. Unless we develop the rural markets it will not be possible to sell the goods produced in the rural areas. If we expect that all the goods produced in the villages should be marketed only in the urban areas it will become very costly due to transport difficulties, and the prices of the goods will rise enormously high. There is also a temptation for villagers to purchase superior mill goods in cities or towns whenever they visit. That temptation should be put an end to.

[SHRIMATI RENU CHAKRAVARTY in the
Chair]

The expansion of markets is an essential condition for the progress of industrialisation in our country. It cannot be brought about without an expansion of the purchasing power of the village population. And the only way of increasing the purchasing power of the village population is to encourage handicraft industry. So, I submit with all seriousness that Government should become a little bit more serious regarding this matter and they should not lightly tinker with this problem.

I am reminded in this connection of a Chinese story of Adam and Eve—Adam once complained that he could not:

live with Eve. So he went to God and told him "take back your Eve. I do not want her." Then God took her back and Adam came away. But he could not live without Eve. So he again went to God and complained "I want Eve back, I cannot live without Eve". And God gave Eve back to him. Then Adam again became disgusted, went to God and complained in the same way and asked him to take her away. God did so. Then for the fourth time he again went to God and asked him to give her back. God asked him, "you must make up of your mind to live with Eve. you must also give an assurance to me that you will protect her and also nurse her and love her, and only on that condition I will give Eve back to you". In the same way, I want the hon. Shri T. T. Krishnamachari to assure us and tell us whether he would love this industry at all. (Shri Algu Rai Shastri: He loves it and would he protect this industry as we would like him to do?)

If he is not serious then there is no use in passing this Bill. So, I appeal to him to give us a clear idea, a clear picture of the policy that he will pursue hereafter with regard to this industry. If this industry collapses, the whole rural economy will collapse and so, from that point of view, I am appealing to him that he should make up his mind and should, as far as possible, give up that lukewarm attitude he has assumed till now and take all measures required to develop this industry. I support this measure thinking that the Ministry will come forward with a bolder policy of aiding this industry.

प्रो० अग्रवाल (वर्धा) : मुझे सूची है कि इस विषय पर बहुत से सदस्य बोलना चाहते हैं। मुझे इस पर बोलने की आवश्यकता भी नहीं थी लेकिन मुझे यह देखकर दुःख हुआ कि खादी के बारे में बहुत से सदस्यों के मन में शंकाओं और गलतफहमियाँ हैं।

डाक्टर खरे ने जो कुछ कहा उसकी तो परवाह करने की कोई ज़रूरत नहीं है क्योंकि उनको तो हर चीज़ में पालिटिक्स दिखलाई देती है। लेकिन मुझे यह देख कर बहुत आश्चर्य हुआ कि कुछ अर्थ शास्त्री, जो इस झगड़स में हैं, उनके भी खादी के बारे में जो झगड़त हैं वे सही नहीं हैं। मैं इस को सिर्फ

आर्थिक दृष्टि से देखना चाहता हूँ। इसमें न गांधी जी प्रति भक्ति का कोई सवाल है न देश भक्ति का कोई सवाल है। यह एक सीधा सवाल है कि हम इस देश में बँकारी की समस्या को हल करना चाहते हैं या नहीं। अगर हल करना चाहते हैं तो मैं आपको कुछ आंकड़े बतलाऊंगा जिनसे आपको यह स्पष्ट दीखेगा कि कताई से कितने लोगों का आज काम मिल रहा है और कितने लोगों की रोज़ी चलती है। मेरे पास अखिल भारतीय चरखा संघ की रिपोर्ट है जिससे आपको पता चलेगा कि सन् १९२४ से, जब कि चरखा संघ की स्थापना हुई थी, तब से सन् १९५२ के अन्त तक करीब बीस करोड़ की खादी बन गई है। इस बीस करोड़ रुपये की खादी में जो कातने वाले थे, जिसमें खास तौर से स्त्रियाँ हैं, उनको करीब दस करोड़ रुपये मिला। बाकी जो रुपये या वह बुनने वालों को मिला और व्यवस्था के खर्च में गया। इससे आपको साफ पता चलेगा कि चरखा संघ ने जो छोटे से परिमाण में काम किया उसमें इतने लोगों को कताई के लिए दस करोड़ रुपये मिल सका। सन् १९५०-५१ के आंकड़े इस प्रकार हैं। चरखा संघ में जो खादी बनती है उसका बनाने वालों में जो कातने वाले हैं, और जिन में खास तौर से स्त्रियाँ और लंगड़े लूले व्यक्ति हैं जिनके पास रोज़ी का और कोई साधन नहीं है, उनकी संख्या दो लाख २२ हजार है और जो बुनने वाले हैं वह सिर्फ १४,५०० हैं। अब आप यह अन्दाज़ा लगा सकते हैं कि अगर हम सिर्फ बुनाई के ऊपर जोर दें तो कुछ हजार लोगों को हम पाल सकते हैं लेकिन अगर कातने पर भी जोर दें तो लाखों को पाल सकते हैं। तो यह सवाल रोज़ी का है। यह सैटीमेंट का सवाल नहीं है। कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि कताई अनइकानमिक है। लेकिन वह अनइकानमिक नहीं है। उसके आंकड़े इस तरह हैं कि आज जो २ लाख २२ हजार कातने वाले हैं उनको औसतन आठ आने रोज़ मिलते हैं, कुछ जगह

[प्रो० अग्रवाल]

सात आनें कहीं ६ आनें कहीं नौ आनें और कहीं दस आनें । चरखा संघ की यह पालिसी इस वक्त है कि धीरे धीरे ऐसा किया जाय कि कातने वालों को आठ घंटे के काम के लिए बारह आनें रोज मिल सकें । इन १२ आनें को आप कुछ मामूली न समझें । एक मामूली अनस्किल्ड लेबरर आज एक रुपया रोज कमाता है । लेकिन अगर हम आज कातने वालों को १२ आनें रोज भी दे सकें, जिनमें कि बहुत से ऐसे लोग हैं जो कि कोई दूसरा काम नहीं कर सकते हैं, जिनमें इतनी शारीरिक शक्ति नहीं है कि वह खेतों में या कोई और सख्त काम कर सकें, तो यह बहुत है । आप उनके लिए क्या करेंगे ? किसी भी सिविलाइज्ड गवर्नमेंट को उन्हें डोल्ल्स देना पड़ेगा या ऐलाउंस देना पड़ेगा । आप यह नहीं कर सकते । अगर आप यह नहीं कर सकते तो क्या वह लोग भूखों मरें ? ऐसी हालत में इस समस्या को हल करने के लिए कताई के सिवा और कोई इलाज नहीं है । और इसमें इनवेस्टमेंट कितना लगता है ? बांस के चरखे की कीमत छः या आठ आनें है, जो किसान चरखा है उसकी कीमत ढाई रुपये से चार रुपये तक है और जो अच्छे चरखे हैं उनकी कीमत आठ दस रुपया है । ज्यादातर मामूली किसान चरखा ही चलाया जाता है जिसकी कीमत दो ढाई रुपये है । अगर इतने इनवेस्टमेंट में कोई १२ आनें रोज कमा ले तो म समझता हूँ कि दुनियां में और कोई दूसरी काटेज इंडस्ट्री नहीं होगी जिसमें इतना विवक टर्न-ओवर हो । फिर भी हम कहते हैं कि स्पिनिंग बेकार है । हम सिर्फ हंडलूम क बात करते हैं । मैं हंडलूम के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ । कौन उसके खिलाफ हो सकता है ? आखिर खादी में भी तो हंडलूम है । लेकिन खादी हंडलूम के साथ साथ स्पिनिंग भी है जो करोड़ों लोगों को आज रोजी दे सकता है और दे रहा है । चरखा संघ ने जो पंचवर्षीय योजना बनायी है वह गवर्नमेंट के सामने रखी गयी है ।

और आल इंडिया खादी ओरगनाइजेशन के सामने भी रखी गई है उसके हिसाब से इन पांच वर्षों में वह ७५ लाख स्पिनर्स को रोजी देना चाहते हैं । ७५ लाख मामूली आंकड़ा नहीं है । आज प्लानिंग कमीशन ने जो आखिरी अध्याय लिखा है अनएम्प्लायमेंट पर, उसके अनुसार कुछ लाख आदमियों को काम मिल सकेगा । लेकिन अगर यह इंडस्ट्री ७५ लाख लोगों को आज दस से १२ आना रोज तक दे सकती है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की जितनी स्कीम्स हैं एम्प्लायमेंट की, उनमें सबसे ज्यादा इफेक्टिव यह स्कीम होगी । तो इस स्कीम को हम इस निगाह से न देखें कि गांधी जी ने यह खादी चलायी थी, इसलिए भाई इसको चलाना चाहिए । यह ठीक नहीं लगता कि खादी न चले । मैं तो इस के द्वारा सिर्फ बेकारी की समस्या को हल करने की बात करना चाहता हूँ ।

मुझे हैरानी हुई और बहुत खुशी भी हुई कि जिस समस्या की आज हम चर्चा करते हैं और जिसके बारे में आज भी हमारे पढ़े लिखे इकानमिक्स के प्रोफेसर यूनीवर्सिटियों और कालिजों में जिक्र करते हैं, उसके बारे में बंगाल गवर्नमेंट के एक अफसर ने जो कि एक कलक्टर थे, मिस्टर कोलवक ने, एक नोट लिखा था, जिसमें से मैं कुछ वाक्य आपको पढ़कर सुनाऊंगा । वह जितने उस वक्त सही थे उतने ही आज भी सही हैं । उस वक्त कुछ अंग्रेजों का जो ख्याल स्पिनिंग के बारे में था वही आज भी सही है । वह लोग कुछ गांधी जी के भक्त नहीं थे, गांधी जी तो उस वक्त पैदा भी नहीं हुए थे । और उन लोगों को इस देश से प्रेम भी नहीं था । लेकिन उस वक्त एक अंग्रेज अफसर ने इसके बारे में आर्थिक दृष्टि से क्या लिखा वह मैं आपके सामने पढ़ना चाहता हूँ । यह सन् १७८६ की बात है ।

"To a Government as enlightened as British India, it cannot be a trifle consideration to provide employment for the poorest classes. No Public provision now exists in these provinces

(उस समय वह बंगाल का जिन्न कर रहे थे) to relieve the wants of the poor and helpless. The only employment in which widows and female orphans, incapacitated for field-labour by sickness or by their rank, can earn a subsistence is by *Spinning*, and it is the only employment to which the females of a family can apply themselves to maintain the men, if these be disqualified for labour by infirmity or by other cause. To all it is a resource which, even though it may not be absolutely necessary for their subsistence, contributes, at least, to relieve the distresses of the poor.

In this view, it appears essential to encourage an occupation which is the sole resource of the helpless poor."

तो आप यह देखें लेकिन वह उस वक्त नहीं चला क्योंकि वह इम्पीरियलिज्म का जमाना था और उस समय स्वार्थ था। स्पिनिंग के बारे में आज भी कोई शक नहीं होना चाहिये कि हैंडलूम के अलावा स्पिनिंग ही एक ऐसी इंडस्ट्री है जो बहुत ही कम इनवस्टमेंट में ज्यादा से ज्यादा टर्न ओवर दे सकती है और जो कि इस देश में करोड़ों लोगों को रोजी दे सकती है।

अब मिस्टर सोमानी ने कहा कि उनको खादी के बारे में कोई ऐतराज तो नहीं है लेकिन वह कहते हैं कि सिर्फ मिल इंडस्ट्री के ऊपर ही टैक्स क्यों लगाया जाय। तो मुझे बहुत आश्चर्य हुआ कि इतनी सीधी बात को समझने में इतनी दिक्कत का क्या कारण है। जिस इंडस्ट्री की वजह से खादी और स्पिनिंग बरबाद हुए अगर वह इंडस्ट्री थोड़ा टैक्स देगी तो कुछ तो उसके पाप धूल सकेंगे। आप यह और इंडस्ट्रीज पर क्यों डालना चाहते हैं। अगर गवर्नमेंट इस चीज को आगे बढ़ायेगी तो और इंडस्ट्रीज पर जैसे तेल और शुगर पर भी लगायेगी ताकि और काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज को फायदा पहुंच सके। लेकिन

इस मामले में कोई कारण नहीं है कि दूसरी इंडस्ट्रीज पर भार डाला जाय।

आखिरी बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं यह बिल्कुल नहीं चाहूँगा कि आप खादी और हैंडलूम को अनइकानमिक समझ कर उन्तेजन दें। लेकिन मेरा तो यह दावा है कि अगर हमारे जो टैक्स टाइल इंडस्ट्रीट्यूटस हैं और जो टैकनालोजीकल कालिज और इंजीनियरिंग कालिज हैं वह इस तरफ ज़रा भी ध्यान दें तो यह समस्या हल हो सकती है और यह काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज ऐसी बन सकती है कि दूसरी इंडस्ट्रीज से अच्छी तरह से कम्पीट कर सकती हैं। आपको मालूम होगा कि गांधी जी ने बहुत कोशिश की और इसके लिये उन्होंने एक लाख का इनाम भी दिया था और कहा कि कोई अच्छा चर्खा निकाले। लेकिन इस पर ध्यान किस का होगा ? न पूंजीपतियों को इस की परवाह थी न गवर्नमेंट को। लेकिन आपने आज के ही अखबार में देखा होगा कि बम्बई में एक नई तरह की मशीनें निकाली गई हैं जिन को आटो स्पिनर्स कहते हैं। यह स्पिनिंग मशीन है जिस में कांडिंग और स्पिनिंग दोनों हैं। और करीब ५ या ६ सौ रुपये में यह मशीन आती है। इसमें दस स्पिंडल्स हैं और अगर इसको हम कोआपरेटिव बेसिस पर चलायें तो स्पिनर्स करीब दो तीन रुपये रोज कमा सकते हैं। मैं उन में से नहीं हूँ जो कि कहते हैं कि जो आज का चर्खा है वह लास्ट बर्ड आन दि सब्जेक्ट है। इतने ज़रूर विकास होना चाहिये। हैदराबाद में जो सर्वोच्च प्रदर्शनी हुई थी उसमें एक नये प्रकार का चर्खा आया जो कि करीब दो सौ रुपये का था, जिसमें ६ स्पिंडल थे और उस पर अगर ठीक से उत्पत्ति की जाय तो करीब दो रुपये रोज की आमदनी हो जायेगी। अगर हम विज्ञान का सहायक लें, वैज्ञानिकों की सहायता लें तो कोई कारण नहीं है कि जो हमारी

[प्रो० अग्रवाल]

स्पिनिंग की इंडस्ट्री है, खादी और हैंडलूम, वह अच्छी तरह मिल से कम्पीट न कर सके। लेकिन अगर उस की तरफ ध्यान न दें और सारी रिसर्च बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज में करें तो यह सबाल कभी हल नहीं हो सकता।

तो मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि इस मामले में काफी चर्चा हुई और खादी के बारे में गवर्नमेंट एक बिल लाई और मैं समझता हूँ कि आगे इस चीज को और बढ़ायेगी। मगर यह काफी नहीं है। अगर इसमें सब की दिलचस्पी रही और हमारे वैज्ञानिकों का भी ध्यान इस तरफ गया तो हम जल्द इस देश की बेकारी की समस्या को बहुत दूर तक हल कर सकेंगे।

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): As I said the other day, the main problem that faces our country today is employment or unemployment. India lives in the villages and therefore this problem has also to be tackled in the villages. It has been agreed that only hand-spinning—I stress the word hand-spinning—and no other occupation could give employment to every village, in every hut. This hand-spinning can give employment even to some sickly or disabled persons. Therefore, khadi, because of the hand-spinning element in it, should be considered on a separate and independent level. When I saw in this Bill that Khadi is bracketed with handloom, with all the sympathy that I have got for handloom, and with all the work that I had been doing and will be doing for handloom weavers in my constituency, I should say, I felt it was not good. Handloom is one of our cottage industries, a very big industry and therefore a very important one. But, that and many other cottage industries, in spite of their importance, cannot be a sort of insurance against unemployment. It is only hand-spinning that can play the role of insurance against unemployment in the country. Therefore, khadi has to be considered in a separate setting.

Again, I was pained to see that only one crore of rupees, probably out of six or seven crores are going to be spent, over the encouragement of khadi. The remaining six or seven

crores will be spent on the handloom industry. Though in the beginning, I think, it will be quite sufficient, because in the last few years, I mean four or five years, we were not able to produce much khadi because we were not able to sell it, if we give a guarantee that every yard of yarn spun or cloth made out of it, that is, every piece of khadi will be sold and that it will be the bounden duty of the Government to see that it is sold or purchased by them, I think much more khadi will be produced and this one crore will not be sufficient. It is just possible that we may require three or four crores.

Here, I may refer to an apprehension that was expressed by my revered friend Mr. Kalappan. He said that if we produce khadi in this way, a day will come when we will not be able to dispose of it. He blamed the Government that they have not made a provision in this behalf. I would humbly suggest that the Government have to run the administration and they have to be more practical. Therefore, they cannot envisage every sort of development that would arise in the future and think of the remedy here and now. Let that situation develop. Certainly, I think the Government will consider that development then as they did think about the handloom weaver, and then will do something about disposing of khadi stocks, if there are large khadi stocks that are not disposed of. In the last few months when the Government gave us a rebate of three annas in the rupee, we found a welcome development. Practically all the excess stocks of khadi were sold. I say, let there be khadi produced so much, to the tune of 20 or 25 crores of rupees. Government will come forward to purchase their own requirements and see that it is sold. I do not think that our country will produce such a large quantity of khadi because, as it is very clear for khadi hand-spinning is the main element, and the wages that we give for hand-spinning are not much. A spinner gets about eight annas on an average. This means that only such men or women will take to it who have got no other employment not only for that day, but rather for few days. Then only he or she will come forward to spin. I do not think there will be huge stocks of khadi.

Having said that, I will come to another problem. There are certain friends here, particularly from the

Opposition, who are pained to see that we have levied a cess of three pies over the textile mills. They want that the textile mills should not be touched at all. They have got all the sympathy for the handloom weaver. Really, I was very much amused to see a Communist friend of mine who pleaded the case of the handloom weaver but did not want to levy this cess of three pies on the mill-made cloth. Because, he fears that thereby the production in the textile mills will be less and there will be some retrenchment of textile mill hands. The apprehension is real. But, we have to see that the conflict or clash of interest between the textile mill worker and the handloom weaver or khadi producer is inherent in the situation. You cannot save all. We have to balance the difficulties and the unemployment problem that arises in these different classes. Therefore, in the interests of the khadi producer and the handloom weaver we have to curtail some production of mill cloth.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): There it is a question of few lakhs; the handloom weavers and spinners are in crores.

Shri Heda: Certainly; the textile mill hands may be in thousands; the handloom weavers are in lakhs and so far as hand-spinning is concerned, their number may go in crores.

Lastly, I come to the problem of the curtailment of 40 per cent of *dhoties*—a new situation that has arisen. Formerly, I think textile mills were earning about eight annas per *dhoti*. Today the *dhoties* are going into the black-market and they are earning about Rs. two per *dhoti*. That means, for 100 *dhoties* formerly they were earning Rs. 50/- For sixty *dhoties*, they are now earning Rs. 120. I would request the Government to study the situation. In the south, the situation is quite different. In the south, handloom cloth was popular and therefore it is being sold there. Here, the handloom cloth was not popular. Therefore, it is not getting sold. The situation in these two places is quite different. I would therefore suggest to the Government that they should help the handloom weavers to such an extent that they could enter into free and fair competition with the mill cloth. Let there be no reduction of 40 per cent, or something like that of *dhoties* or *sarees*. Let the handloom *sari* or *dhoti*

be encouraged or subsidised to such an extent, say about one anna per yard or something like that, so that free competition between the handloom and textile mill may help these two industries and we may go ahead. I think that this three pies cess is only the beginning. If we require more, certainly Government will come forward to levy more cess, and thus get more money to help particularly the khadi industry and the handloom industry.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I confess that I have the misfortune of not being one of those who are offering their whole-hearted support to this measure which is a mixture of good and evil.

An Hon. Member: Half-hearted?

Shri V. G. Deshpande: It is a mixture of good intentions and bad execution. The intentions are really good because the plight of the weavers and those engaged in the handloom industry is really pitiable. I represent a constituency in which is situated Chanderi, a well-known centre of handloom industry, whose products have gone to distant lands. And I find that new problems are being created for this industry.

The first problem which is an obstacle in the progress of this industry is the supply of yarn. After the war was over and when all the princely order vanished and Zamindaris were abolished, we find that luxury goods which were really the pride of India are not getting markets. And particularly in my constituency, I find the weavers remaining unemployed because the costly goods are not getting market. But my real feeling is and my opposition to this measure is that the problem is not being tackled in a manner in which it ought to be tackled. This problem has to be viewed from your approach to the economic problem of the country. I must say with great regret that this measure, as is known from the very name "the Khadi and other Handloom Industries", is really a reactionary, a medieval, antiquated, superstitious and revivalist approach to the economic problem of the country. I find that the real problem of the handloom industry was a problem for a transitional period. We know, and we know it definitely in spite of the lectures of the learned Professors and Members from the opposite side, that Khadi is not economic and can never be economic. The handloom indus-

[Shri V. G. Deshpande.]

try had its place, Khadi had its place in the economy of the country because it was a supplementary industry to the mill industry. It was never in conflict with the textile industry. We know that in the past the textile industry, the mechanised industry, could not sufficiently cater to the needs of the country and therefore we wanted these handloom industries and Khadi to prosper, and we were prepared to have *swadeshi* even at a sacrifice and with inconvenience to us.

The next problem is this: What is the economic order that we visualise before our eyes? Do we want that the country should have spinning wheels and *charkhas* or do we want an up-to-date mechanised industry? My feeling is that this country, if it is to make any progress, should have an up-to-date textile industry. But, at the same time, I am conscious of the difficulties of the weavers in the handloom industry. I know that we could not develop the textile industry to its fullest. Now, here the Bill which is being placed before the House wants the textile industry to be taxed, wants the common man, the consumer, to be taxed so that Khadi may prosper. I do understand that there are millions of men who are engaged in this industry, and help has to be given to them. If not from the textile industry, from some other sources help has to go to them. But we must realise that this handloom industry and Khadi will be only in a transitional period. Once those who are now engaged in these industries are absorbed in the textile industry, this handloom industry ought to go with the exception of a small sector which caters to specialised needs. I do realise that this handloom industry has an aesthetic aspect. I know that the gold brocades of Banaras or Madura and Bangalore textiles have got renown all over the world, and for such specialised purposes, this handloom industry will have a place in the economy of the country, and it will be the duty of the Government to find markets all over the world for them. After the princely order has gone, we may find merchant princes and industrialist princes in America and other countries as buyers and purchasers of these goods. But, beyond this, if we want that this handloom industry should continue for ever and if we begin to organize our industry on that line, I feel that we are doing a great disservice to the country. And with this object in view, if you really want to

give help to this industry, I really want that there should not be a conflict between the textile industry and this industry.

Then, my next complaint is that you are taxing the consumers for no fault of theirs, and particularly, my objection is against Khadi. I do respect Khadi. I know that those who started this Khadi movement were actuated by the noblest and most patriotic motives. But today I find that the motive is having very disastrous results. An hon. friend of mine yesterday said that for the last 30 years we are observing Khadi as a religious principle. I do realize that there can be some people who can look to Khadi as a religious principle, but I do not want that these bigots of Khadi religion should levy a tax on those who do not believe in this religion of Khadi. I believe this cess to be a sort of *jazia* on those who do not believe in Khadi.

Then, I must say that I oppose what my hon. friend Prof. S. N. Agarwal said. I really feel that the economic problem of unemployment cannot be solved by this Khadi. He quoted certain figures where a few lakhs were employed, and he thinks that on Rs. 15 a month we want all the country to be employed. My feeling is that this problem of unemployment can be better solved by completely industrialising the country and lessening the hours of work, and by that way giving employment to a larger number of people. And I appeal to the hon. Minister, that he has to develop a real scheme for giving help to the handloom industry. As has been made very clear by many able speakers on this Bill, this Rs. five or Rs. six crores is not going to give any real substantial help to the handloom industry. As against this doubtful advantage, I find that every consumer, everybody who purchases a yard of cloth, will have to pay three pies as a homage to the political fads of the party in power. I feel that in this way you are not going to give any real help to this industry. You should take a review of the whole industry and you will have to decide. It is no use reserving *dhoties* and *saries* for this industry. I know that *dhoties* manufactured by handloom industry cannot compete with the *dhotis* manufactured by the textile industry. I feel that instead of doing this, they should see what part of the handloom industry can be retained and what should be ultimately discarded. Then they have to make a plan as to the number of years in

which this industry can be liquidated, reserving only that portion which deserves to be retained in this country. And I feel that only for one generation or two we can have this handloom industry. Beyond that you cannot have this handloom industry in this country, and you have to reorientate and give different channels of employment to the people.

Then, a point has been made out that this spinning gives employment in the spare hours to the agriculturist and women. I understand that it really can give employment, but there are alternative methods of giving employment and our Government has not given any serious thought to this question. I was much amused at a funny suggestion that prizes were declared for improved forms of *charkha*. I cannot find anything more funny than this. This *charkha* was in existence 200 years ago. This has been improved and our present textile industry is the improved form of the *charkha* of the old handloom industry. Now, you have taken the hands of the clock back. Here after 200 years, we are advertising in the papers that we want a *charkha* which will spin more, and a handloom which will weave more. Go to any mill, and you will find *charkhas* and handlooms which will spin more and weave more. Therefore, in spite of my sympathy for the handloom industry and my protest against the aid being insufficient for the poor weavers in the country, I oppose this revivalistic Bill.

5 P.M.

Shri Sarmah (Goalghat—Jorhat)
rose—

Mr. Chairman: I shall just explain the position. There are quite a number of hon. Members who have been sending slips to me. Since we have to finish this Bill by this evening, I suggest that those hon. Members who are anxious to speak should reserve their remarks for the second and third reading stage. So I will now call upon the hon. Minister. Afterwards, during the second and third reading, others may take their chance. Otherwise, it is not possible to finish this Bill by this evening.

Dr. M. M. Das (Burdwan—Reserved—Sch. Castes): On a point of order, madam. I want to know whether the closure will be proper and in order, without a chance having been given to an hon. Member who has moved an amendment for referring this Bill to a Select Committee, to put forward his arguments before the House.

Mr. Chairman: This has already been decided upon earlier. I think the hon. Member should have raised the objection at that time. At the moment, therefore, that is no point of order. So, I shall now call upon the hon. Minister to start his reply.

Shri Sarmah: Madam, may I make a submission, before you call upon the hon. Minister, with your leave? I really do not want to make a long speech on this subject. The Deputy-Speaker was pleased to say that every State will take part in the debate. Therefore, if you can spare only five minutes, I shall speak for four or five minutes.

Mr. Chairman: I had called upon the hon. Member a few minutes ago, but he was not in the House. So, I am afraid, it is not possible now.....

Shri Sarmah: I had to walk round after giving the slip.

Mr. Chairman: Obviously then it was a case of delayed action, and I am afraid I cannot call the hon. Member just now. I shall call him at the next stage.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I am afraid it will be impossible for me to do justice to a debate which has been carried on for more than six hours and a quarter, in the course of which, the speakers have dealt with the subject from different points of view. In fact, one redeeming feature about it is that the different points of view expressed by hon. Members in this House more or less cancelled the criticism of other hon. Members. The net result—I think the House should evaluate the nature of the debate—is that there is hardly anything left for me to say.

But there is one point on which I should like to lay stress once again. This is purely a taxation measure. The operative clause is only clause 3. On the quantum of the tax and the nature of the tax, the remarks made were really very few. The other clauses are merely padding clauses. In fact, the expenditure that is going to be made out of this cess collection is a matter which will come within the scope of parliamentary control. Hon. Members will realise that they have passed the Demand for Rs. two crores, as a token for expenditure on khadi and handlooms, when they accepted the Demand for Grants in respect of the Commerce and Industry Ministry. No portion of the money can be spent without parliamentary sanction, and the

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

money that is spent will be under the control of the Auditor-General. Naturally when we want to spend more money, we shall come forward to Parliament with a Supplementary Demand for Grant.

If that is recognised, to a very large extent, the remarks made by hon. Members in this House are in the nature of advice to Government in the matter of spending the money. I can give this assurance to hon. Members—I have got copies of the debate for two days, and I hope I shall be able to get another volume for today's debates—that I shall have the detailed remarks made categorised, and shall certainly try, as far as possible, to accommodate the views expressed on the floor of the House by hon. Members. After that assurance, I think, hon. Members will forgive me if I do not deal in detail with the remarks made by them.

Nevertheless there are one or two matters to which I could refer, because of the interest that the speeches aroused in the House.

Mr. Ramaswamy from Salem—I am glad to see he is here—comes from a constituency which is predominantly dominated by handloom weavers. Salem weavers in the Madras State are well-known, and he would be barely doing justice to his conscience and his constituency, if he had not intervened in this debate. But a good point does not get emphasised all the more by adding figures in support of it, which are not strictly accurate. Mr. Ramaswamy referred to the policy of Government that they have given permission for the expansion of looms. In fact, that is my preliminary headache. The textile industry everywhere wants an expansion of looms. Otherwise they consider that the mill is uneconomic. Oftentimes, even a Government like the Madras Government which look after the interests of the handloom weavers very zealously, have had to recommend an addition of a few looms here and a few looms there. Very often they have refused permission for the installation of looms which have been bought by mills, because of permission given to them formerly. It is a fact that the Government have been refusing permission for installation of looms for some time past, the idea being that we should have before us the full picture which will emerge when the Textile Inquiry Committee reports. Then we can definitely make up our minds whether we want an expansion of the weaving capacity of the mills, and if so for what purpose. That be-

ing the policy, I think over a period of time only about 300 looms have been allowed in the aggregate, a few here and a few there, because of certain promises given in the past, or certain commitments made in the past. So, the policy of Government is still more or less the same, as Mr. Ramaswamy would have it to be.

The next speech of importance was that of my hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. My hon. friend has been extremely considerate to me, and therefore half-humourously and half-seriously he posed a problem which looks on the face of it not merely unexceptionable, but also something which cannot be unanswerable, viz. he quoted scripture, scripture in the building up of which, at any rate, from the verbal point of view, he and I have been joint participants in the sense that we were joint participants in the framing of the Constitution. He referred to certain articles of the Constitution, falling within what is called the 'Directive Principles'. My hon. friend knows fully well that the Directive Principles have been separated from the Fundamental Rights for the reason that we felt that while political rights could be made justiciable, the economic rights could not be made justiciable, and should be more or less a beaconlight for Governments that come into being in the future and work the Constitution, and try to set goals before themselves which they ought to achieve. Well, I have not changed my mind in regard to the attitude that I had towards these provisions of the Constitution, at the time the Constitution was framed or when we drafted those provisions. In fact, the only justification for my being here either as a Member of the House or as a member of this Government is that I should help in my own little way, however ineffective it might be, towards the culmination of those ideals which we cherished when we framed the Constitution. That is the whole purpose of my being here.

An Hon. Member: A good beginning.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: But at the same time I am hardened. My upbringing has been Philistinish—has not been philosophical. Metaphysics has no play in my scheme of things. I am a hardened, practical man, as I have been in the past, though my practical wisdom might be deserting me when I am occupying this office to some extent.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Doubtful?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: What is doubtful? The hon. Member is himself doubtful about it.

Shri B. S. Murthy: You are more philosophical.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The point really is—digressions apart—that is the goal that we have set ourselves, the achievement of which, as my hon. friend, the Finance Minister mentioned the other day, will undoubtedly take a period of time. The time factor will be determined by the amount of ruthlessness which the Government could use in that process. Unfortunately, having a democratic set-up, we have to, at any rate, pay heed to the loud outpourings from vested interests. After all, a debate like this would have revealed that there is no community of outlook in regard to what we have to do in economic matters. In fact, there are certain matters in which objectives might be common. For instance, take my hon. friends opposite. It may be that I would like to score a point over them by flinging some word at them and they might do the same thing. Essentially—leave alone their ideology—our objectives are the same. What is different happens to be the method; the method or technique, the amount of force which we could use to gain that objective are entirely different. And, therefore, the emphasis is different. We approach the same thing from different points of view—though the goal is the same. Well, if at least that amount of common factor is there between us and hon. Members on that side of the House—some of them who represent certain interests—probably there might be a little more understanding. But that is not so in the work. So we, the Members of the Congress Party, responsible for the administration, do firmly adhere to the view that every one of those provisions—the articles under the Directive Principles—must be furthered to some extent at least during the five years that we are in office, and if we, luckily, have another spell of office, we must take it up a little further. After all, that is the main basis for this plan.

My hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, will realise that the fact that these provisions are in the Directive Principles indicates very clearly that a period of time is necessary for us even to reach optimum limits towards achieving that goal. Let me take for instance, a country like the U.K., about which we have statistics. Full employment is a religion which has

a higher place than Christianity in the U.K., and we get the figure of three per cent. unemployment, or four per cent. unemployment; whereas in a country like the United States which is far richer, the percentage of unemployment is higher. Of course, we do not have figures of employment in regard to other countries where Governments do take a very keen interest in regard to providing work for everybody and where these are parts of the provisions of the Constitution, but nevertheless not justiciable, no more justiciable than the political rights included in the Constitution. I am merely mentioning it, not for the purpose of either belittling the ideas of certain countries or praising the ideas of other countries, but merely to point out that even in the countries whose resources are adequate for the purpose, the human factor involved, the amount of control that they have to exercise—all make the goal one that cannot be reached to the extent that we people want it to be. There is always a little lag. Unfortunately in our country to talk of full employment itself is a travesty against the truth. In a country where there is a lot of under-employment and there is a lot of disguised unemployment, for us to reach the level of full employment is going to take a long long time. Even supposing by a miracle, we become a totalitarian country, until we could by a mere edict change the phase of the economic life, even then the time factor cannot be altogether done away with. It might take 25 or 30 years before we reach anything like nearness to full employment.

I would ask my hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, to whom any compulsion even in the matter of control of prices is something which is abhorrent, if he really considers the transformation of this economy into an economy where totalitarian pressures can be exercised? Very possibly many hon. Members on my side who are associated with vested interests would like to categorise me as a 'pocket Hitler' because of the amount of pressure that sometimes I try to put on certain types of vested interests so that they might fall in line with certain limited objectives of Government in the matter of prices. If my hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava will envisage the consequences of our taking that step so that we can reach the goal in a relatively short time, well, I am perfectly prepared to fall in line. If the emphasis would be made by democratic discipline, there would be nothing more welcome so far as I am concerned, personally. I am not speak-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

ing as a member of the Government. Speaking personally. I would like that goal to be reached very soon, and if you have that amount of democratic discipline so that we can alter our economic structure to some extent as time goes on, well nothing would please me more. Therefore, my hon. friend must realise that this is a first step towards that end. It may be that we would provide employment only for three lakhs of weavers—perhaps four perhaps five. Even then it is better than not providing any organised employment for anybody at all. The mere fact that the results achieved would only be fractional compared to the size of the problem is not a thing against taking this step towards the results which we want to achieve. I do hope that my hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, will bear with me and allow us to proceed so that as we go on and find our feet, we might enlarge the scope of the good work that we want to do. Of course, he has proposed many amendments—some of them may be in order, some of them may be out of order. But all the powers that he envisages here are in the possession of Government. We have got the Industries (Regulation and Development) Act under which we can control all the scheduled industries. We have the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act under which we are now controlling the textile industry. All this limitation of looms to be employed for purposes of production of dhoties—to 60 per cent of what they obtained in 1951-52—is done under the powers that Government possesses. There is no point in asking for more powers. So I would urge upon him to bear with me. He exercises usual tolerance towards my shortcomings. Allow me to proceed with his blessings and co-operation in the direction which we intend to proceed.

Well, hon. Members undoubtedly would expect that the next place of importance in the speeches would undoubtedly go to the speech made by my illustrious predecessor in this office, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. Well hon. Members would please note that I was at a disadvantage so far as my ability to reply to the hon. Member is concerned, considering that I have been in this office only for 11 months and he has occupied this office for very nearly—from August 1947 to April 1950; arithmetic shows that it is very nearly three times the time that I have been here. Yet notwithstanding the fact of the present position in which he is placed, that is in

opposition to us. I must admit that he has been helpful and has been very constructive in his criticism. I would not like to take exception to anything that he said. Of course, naturally, the temptation to twit the Government cannot be resisted—not certainly to a person of the oratorical abilities of my hon. friend—and he did indulge in a little effort—very gentle, certainly considerate—when he quoted scripture and said: 'Look here, you fellows do not want to follow that scripture. What have you done? You have forgotten the author of the scripture. You really do not believe in khadi but, nevertheless, for reasons of your own you would put khadi into this Bill so that you can use the money for the purpose of furthering khadi.' The difference should be observed between the speech made by my hon. friend Dr. S. P. Mookerjee and that of my friend and old colleague Dr. Khare and my friend from Madhya Bharat in the saffron cap, the difference between a person who is kind, notwithstanding our present difference, and somebody who would have no consideration for the other side. I am very grateful to the learned Doctor for the gentleness with which he dealt with us.....

An Hon. Member: Both are Doctors.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I mean doctor in the sense that he is not an M.B. but a doctor nevertheless. His suggestions were born out of experience. May I assure him that the pitfalls that he envisages, I am partly aware of. I have been very greatly enlightened—I shall certainly use the words of caution that he has uttered to avoid these pitfalls which would occur in the administration of the very limited measure that we have before us.

In regard to this question of khadi, I think the hon. Speaker, when he was here for the very short time, did make the point very clear. Of course, politically khadi is something of value; it is a political uniform for the Congress Party. It is a matter that cannot be denied. But so far as this measure of help that you want to render is concerned, it is not from a political point of view, nor is it from the purely transcendental point of view, that my hon. friend Dr. S. P. Mookerjee said—it is one on which I probably do not have any faith or certainly which I would not be able to achieve. We are not speaking in terms of absolute values today. No Government can afford to talk in terms of absolute value. This is

not the proper forum for that. In this grim atmosphere of practical politics, absolute values must necessarily be tempered. To me it is a purely practical problem. As I said, there is this problem of unemployment, and under-employment disguised as unemployment. And, to the extent that we could provide some employment to people by way of hand-spinning, I think, it is a thing that we could do. I would relate my own experience. During the time when in an urban constituency I had to go from house to house. I found that there was a lot of misery among the lower middle classes and a considerable amount of what you would call disguised unemployment. It may be that the *charkha*, whether it is one in which you squat and spin or is one in which you have a pedal and spin, is a thing which would not altogether relieve their distress, but give them something to do, some hope and some cheer. From that point of view, even if it is a matter of a *charkha* worker going to a house and telling the people, 'please do this, we will try to help, we will pay you some money and take the fruits of your labour', the very sympathy that is extended to them by a person who is a worker is enough to put some cheer into their lives. So, it is a matter of social work to a very large extent. But, I think, in spite of the harshness of the criticisms levelled against this Bill by my friend Mr. Deshpande, he did recognise this fact that there is some element even in this *charkha*, if it is not political, that can be made use of. That is what we propose to do. I would not underestimate the value of hand-spinning in the absence of anything else. Supposing it is possible for me to provide a kind of employment for a person in the village, say lock-making or some other thing in which the return would be greater, I would not for ideological reasons prevent him from earning a little more money by some other work. So far as the pure ideological aspect of hand-spinning is concerned, it does not deter me from providing some money. Our approach is to put a little more money into his pocket. This is a practical approach, rather than an ideological approach.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

That is why the hon. Speaker was quite right in indicating to the House that the aspect is purely an economic aspect and not a political aspect. Politically, it is still our garb and we are not prepared to give it up in spite of the fact that it might attract, amongst other things, abuses, and whatever else that follow, brickbats and other things. But it is not that

we want to serve. The cause we want to serve is the cause of the person who is under-employed or unemployed, in whom we can put some hope, some cheer. One hon. friend mentioned to me, "what is this one crore of rupees?" I quite agree. In the face of the unemployment in this country, this one crore is nothing. But, we have to keep in mind that the money must be usefully spent and we must devise ways and means in which it can be usefully spent. It does not matter ultimately if it reaches a poor man who is needy. The economic out-turn from him is not the vital factor, though it will be wrong for us to give doles without some work. But, as we go on finding our feet, and if it really solves the problem to some extent, then, I think Government will be prepared to spend some money, two, three, four or five crores. I would venture to say that it is not contradictory. There is no element of contrariety, in the principles in regard to the *charkha*. But the only thing is we feel that we cannot go the whole way; we cannot, as a Government, talk in terms of absoluteness. We feel that we can go half the way with you and if this will help relieve unemployment to some extent we are very grateful. That is how we propose to go.

In regard to the handloom, the thing has been thrashed out; we had various opinions. In fact, I think, I should extend my gratitude to Dr. Krishnaswami, the economist in him, for sky-lighting a point in regard to this handloom industry, which I think is very necessary as a corrective to the miasma of views which enshrouded the entire discussion. He said two things, which I think are quotable. He pointed to the fact that unregulated entry into the handloom industry was to be a pressure on the *bona fide* handloom population, and that is a fact. Whatever the hon. Members who are interested in the handloom weaver may say, it is undoubtedly a fact that out of these 28 and odd lakhs of looms which exist—out of it four lakhs might be deducted as being non-commercial looms from Assam—24 lakhs of looms a good lot of them, have come into being merely because the possession of a handloom entitled the person to a quota card for yarn and that quota card could be sold in the black market. It was mentioned by one hon. friend from Mysore, that a watchman in one of the factories was complaining that he was not getting enough, because he came from Salem. He said that before he came as a watchman he was getting about Rs. 40 to Rs. 50 for his quota card. Now, the quota card was of no value to him be-

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

cause yarn is freely available and what he was getting as a watchman was not enough. It may look apocryphal, but nevertheless it is a fact. It is an hon. Member who told me that. I think it is a reality.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Is it not a small percentage?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Percentage are extremely deceptive. My hon. friend would have it as a small percentage. Perhaps an hon. Minister from Madras would say in private that it is a large percentage but in public he would say it is a small percentage. But, unfortunately the liberty that we have in this House to speak the truth does not extend to the platforms in which we address gatherings. And, truth is very unpalatable sometimes. I would like to tell my hon. friend that the percentage is fairly large. But nevertheless this is neither here nor there.

What I am trying to illustrate is the point that was made by Dr. Krishnaswami that there is an unregulated entry and an onrush into this field by people who are not professional artisans but they have come in because of various attractions it provided. After all, a ghost loom is not a difficulty as a ghost ration card is not a difficulty. Any check of ration cards always reveals that about 40 to 50 per cent. of ration cards are ghost cards. So, ghost looms are there, and that is the point that Dr. Krishnaswami made. He said, "If you are going to help this industry, you have to guard against this unauthorised entry; it is going to create that problem, and you have to choose between sheep and goats." That is precisely what I emphasized. I said that to begin with we propose to confine our activities to those weavers who are in a co-operative society. At any rate, that is the suggestion that we propose to make to State Governments. If State Governments feel that they can operate in a slightly different way, they are the best judges of the situation. I can only find loopholes in their practical working a little later, but I cannot fetter the discretion of the State Governments altogether.

The second point that Dr. Krishnaswami made was that we did seem to consider that all tastes could run to a pattern and that we can dictate the pattern. I referred to this aspect of the matter myself and said that we think that Government is like Providence and can always tell people what they ought to do or buy irrespective of what is called the consumer choice.

I am glad that I find an echo in the speech of Dr. Krishnaswami on this point. He has said that only some tastes are natural; others are creative; and all tastes are not natural. And that is exactly our idea. Through the organisation that we propose to set up, we wish not merely to help the weaver but also him to understand his market and if necessary educate the market, and that is where I think my hon. friend Shri Deshpande, coming as he does from a constituency like Chandernagore, has done scant justice to an administration which I think ought to be praised, if for nothing else, at least for the good work that it has done for handicrafts and handlooms—I mean the Madhya Bharat Administration. I have personally seen the work done by it in regard to Chandernagore and Maheshwari *saries*. I have seen the difficulties of the weavers. They were not aware of the fact that fashions had changed and Maharashtra women no more wore the nine yards *sari*, but they used the 5½ yards *sari*, notwithstanding the influence of my hon. friend Shri Deshpande. It took some time for the Madhya Bharat Administration through their Director of Industries to go and tell these people to make a change. They have now made a change and the *saries* that are made are very good. The borders have got various very attractive designs, and when one sees the *saries*, one almost feels that one might wear a *sari* himself and these *saries* are finding a market in Delhi. (Shri V. B. Gandhi: Mr. Deshpande wears a nine yard dhoti.) I do think that these *saries* are finding a market. The only trouble is again that the weaver does not know about the change in the tastes of the people. He has to see the change in the type of demand and realise that he must change his pattern in order to suit the tastes of the person who buys it. Here, I am glad to say that the Administration of Madhya Bharat through its Industries Department has gone to these people and told them to make the change. It has given them designs. It has bought their goods, exhibited them in their emporia and sold them in the market by bringing them up to Delhi and other places, so that my fear is that the position may arise that when my hon. friend stands for election again, the people there will say, "The Congress Government have helped us to sell our *saries*; we will not vote for you." That is a possibility.

My hon. friend Dr. Krishnaswami also emphasized this experience of Great Britain, namely, the clothier element in the structure of what you

might call a cottage industry, viz. the middleman who is really interested in bridging the gulf between the market and the producer. I would like to mention here another point, which I think we might even borrow from the experience of England. It has been mentioned here often. People ask: "What is the value of Khadi? It would die." Let us see the experience in England in regard to what are known as Harris tweeds, homespun by England, which have a market all over the world. Harris tweeds are produced in the Outer Hebrides. They are handspun and handwoven. The processing of it is so peculiar that it has got a value and a duration far beyond anything that is machinemade. Anything that is made in the Outer Hebrides—it may be Harris Island or Lewis Island or one of the other islands belonging to the Outer Hebrides—has a market for all time. Notwithstanding the fact that the U.K. is a highly mechanised country, these Harris tweeds go to another highly mechanised country, namely, America, where they have a valuable market. I do maintain that it may not be anything as big as all that, but Khadi—as some hon. Members have mentioned—can be maintained and sustained, provided we keep alive the sentiment attached to it. After all what is the sentiment? It is that you are free today and you want to be free for all time, and I am afraid when we give up our adherence to Khadi—however imperfect that adherence may be—we probably lose the concept of freedom altogether, and so long as we are a freedom loving country I think that that sentiment can be furthered by telling people that something is being done for the man who has not benefited by the freedom that you enjoy in this House. So, in order to make that man feel the benefits of the freedom that we have won, let us for God's sake keep this sentiment alive, and I do maintain that it is easily possible to maintain that sentiment in a matter like this. After all, what is the sacrifice? We are not envisaging a complete transformation of the popular demand of 5000 million yards of cloth to Khadi. That is not my aim at all. If I could possibly get within a measurable distance of time 100 million yards of Khadi absorbed in this country, I should be grateful and I should indeed be happy, and I think there is enough strength in the sentiment for us to be able to build up a trade for 100 million yards of Khadi within the next two or three years.

I did not understand my hon. friend Dr. Khare, who spoke in a language

which I could not follow. I tried to get a translation, but without success (An Hon. Member: It is not worth while.) I do not think that it is right to say that. Dr. Khare is an old friend of mine. He sat here and we sat there. He is a very good man generally, but then he is obsessed by an idea that something has happened to him. It is something like a child that has been burnt when it was young. The feeling of being burnt is always there. He has been burnt in after-life—maybe rightly or wrongly—but the feeling that he has been burnt is always there. But I do hope that this House will not take umbrage in what he says and merely understand that it is the outpouring of a man who feels hurt and attributes all the evils to Khadi. If he has a mental satisfaction by pouring ridicule on Khadi, I am prepared to let him have it and I will not say anything against what he said.

I feel that I have to some extent covered some of the ground, but I do want to repeat what I said in the beginning, that in regard to the methods to be utilised for the furtherance of the handloom industry and the khadi industry, the suggestions made by hon. Members in the course of their speeches here would be carefully noted and followed to the extent that it is humanly possible for me to do. May I say finally that I am grateful to the large measure of support that this House has given, and I do hope that the consideration that it has shown to me and to the Bill at this stage will be continued during the rest of the year, so that I might get over the initial teething troubles and when I come next year with the budget statement I might be able to present a little more rosy picture in regard to my attempts for sustaining the khadi and handloom industries.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are two amendments—one for circulation of the Bill and the other for reference to Select Committee.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Dr. M. M. Das: I thought when I spoke, I mentioned that I would not like it to be placed before the House. I think there is no need at all. Anyhow, I beg leave to withdraw it.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of an additional duty of excise on cloth for raising funds for the purpose of developing khadi and other handloom industries and for promoting the sale of khadi and other handloom cloth be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2.—(Definitions).

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara): I beg to move:

In page 1, line 8, for "15th day of February, 1953" substitute "15th day of May, 1953".

Dr. M. M. Das: I beg to move:

In page 1, for lines 11 to 13, substitute:

"(c) 'handloom cloth' means any cloth woven from silk, wool and cotton yarns manufactured in the country on looms worked by manual labour;"

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I beg to move:

In page 1, line 13, add at the end "or power".

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): I beg to move:

(i) In page 1, line 15, omit "khadi or other".

(ii) In page 1, omit lines 16 and 17.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendments moved:

(1) In page 1, line 8, for "15th day of February, 1953" substitute "15th day of May, 1953".

(2) In page 1, for lines 11 to 13, substitute:

"(c) 'handloom cloth' means any cloth woven from silk, wool and cotton yarns manufactured in the country on looms worked by manual labour."

(3) In page 1, line 13, add at the end "or power".

(4) In page 1, line 15, omit "khadi or other".

(5) In page 1, omit lines 16 and 17.

Does the hon. Minister accept any of the amendments?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid I will not be able to accept any of them.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Now, it so happens that the Bhakra-Nangal scheme is materialising and we will have plenty of power in the Punjab and other parts of the country as well. It is possible that several handlooms in these parts of the country may be driven by power.

Sari T. T. Krishnamachari: Then it becomes a power-loom, not a handloom.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: What I am anxious to guard against is that these people should not be charged the cess of three pies. If a person has not got a factory, or is not employing a large number of people, but is using power to drive his handlooms in that case he should not be charged any cess.

Shri K. C. Sodhia (Sagar): I oppose this amendment of Pandit Thakur Das.

Dr. M. M. Das: The purpose of my amendment is to restrict the use of foreign imported yarn by our handloom industry; in other words, I do not like to encourage the use of artificial silk, staple fibres and foreign imported woollen yarns in our handlooms which we are going to subsidise from the taxation imposed by this Bill.

About artificial silk, my first objection is that it is killing our natural silk industry, not because artificial silk is cheap or cheaper than our natural silk, but because of the fact that artificial silk is creating a disgust and antagonism in the minds of the consumers. What is done is known to several members of the House. Artificial silk is sold in the market by unscrupulous traders as natural silk and ultimately when the consumer comes to know the quality of the cloth that he has got as pure silk, he becomes disgusted and this disgust extends to natural silk also.

There are two factories in this country that produce artificial silk yarn. The bulk of artificial silk yarn that is consumed by our mills is imported from foreign countries. Now, are you going to encourage these imports to be used by our handlooms, by giving assistance from taxation?

About staple fibre, not a single yarn of the fibre is manufactured in this country, although there are enough materials in this country from which staple fibre can be manufactured. I would like to put a question to the House. Are you going to impose an additional excise duty and spend that money to popularise the use of and increase the consumption of foreign imported yarns, such as artificial silk, staple fibre and imported wool yarn? My feeling on this point is very strong. We are going to impose this additional excise duty on mill-made cloth only to give support and encouragement to some of our own important cottage industries and handloom industries.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Is rayon industry our industry or not?

Dr. M. M. Das: If we do not take steps at this stage to exclude foreign imported yarns from being used by the handloom industry, then my submission to this House is that the purpose of this measure is going to be defeated to a great extent.

Then, another very important point which I want to make is about foreign imported wool yarns. About this my submission before the House is that it is high time that our Government took up the development of the wool industry also. We are exporting every year large quantities of raw wools to other countries and at the same time we are importing large quantities of processed wool and wool yarns from other countries. There is enough scope in this country for the development of the wool industry. Moreover, the wool producing areas of India are one of the most backward and poverty-stricken parts of the country. The economy of the entire hill people inhabiting the region from Assam to Punjab is intimately connected with development of the wool industry. If taxation is to be resorted to for the development of our cottage industries why not take the fullest advantage of such a taxation and derive the maximum benefit out of it? My submission therefore is that every attempt should be made to utilise the proceeds from this taxation not only to develop the khadi and handloom industry but also other industries ancillary to the khadi and handloom industry. There is a real necessity to stop or at least not to give encouragement either directly or indirectly to the use of foreign imported yarns, whether it is artificial silk, whether it is staple fibre or woolen yarns. In our handloom industry which we are going to subsidise by the proceeds from this taxation.

I hope my amendment will be accepted.

Shri K. C. Sodhia rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is opposed to it, is it not?

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Yes, Sir.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: My first amendment is to omit the words "khadi or other" in page 1, line 15. Line 15 gives the definition of "handloom industries" and if we omit the words "khadi or other" from that definition it makes no difference to the meaning. In my opinion the words "khadi or other" in this definition are quite redundant.

With regard to my second amendment, my suggestion is to omit lines 16 and 17, that is sub-clause (e) of clause 2 which reads:

" 'khadi' means any handloom cloth woven from yarn handspun in India."

To make my object clear I would like to draw your attention to the other amendments which I have tabled on the other clauses, including the long title of this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Those we can see when we come to them.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: My object is to exclude khadi altogether from the scope of this Bill. So far as helping the handloom industry is concerned there is no difference of opinion from any quarter and it is recognised that the handloom industry occupies a very important place in the economy of the country and is in great need of encouragement, protection and help. But as regards the khadi industry I should like to exclude it from the scope of this Bill mainly because by its inclusion here there is scope for frittering away some of the funds, which would otherwise have been available to the handloom industry, on something which may not yield the results that are expected. I have nothing disparaging to speak against khadi. But, as I understand, behind the economics of khadi there was a definite ideology of non-violence and non-exploitation. It is hard for me to understand how we can justify the existence of Defence expenditure to the tune of Rs. 200 crores with the khadi ideology.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us not go into all this at this stage. The consideration stage is over. Now it is the clause-by-clause stage. The hon. Member may confine himself to the

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

economic aspect of it. Enough has been said about the ideologies and other things.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I would just submit to you, Sir, that the Chairman stopped the general discussion and told us that we would have an opportunity of having our say on the amendments. That is why we could not develop the point in the general discussion, not having had an opportunity. But I crave your indulgence for the simple reason that unless I make this object clear, my purpose in moving these amendments would not be appreciated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that I can say is the hon. Member must confine himself to the economic aspect—there may be many points—he must feel honestly that khadi is useless, you cannot go on developing it, it will be a waste. It will be an economic issue. He cannot go on with the political issue "I am opposed to it because the Government was opposed to me and therefore I do not want the House to take this into consideration" and so on. I do not think there is any good going on like that.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: Sir, I submit to your ruling but I would like to make it clear that I had no intention of going into the political aspect of the matter. I only wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there are certain approaches which are basically different. The main object of the Bill is to reduce unemployment in the country by helping a cottage industry which provides employment to a large section of our population. As regards the employment policy there can be different approaches to this.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Sir, he is going into the principle of the Bill.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: To cite an example, where a country suffers from population pressure on land and unemployment you have to lay greater stress on the human factor, not on your industrial and other policies. Now, in the past we have extolled the achievement of China in building the dam without foreign aid or machinery, just by utilising their manpower. But here we find a different approach altogether. Here in India, where we suffer from this unemployment problem to such an extent, we are spending crores of rupees on irrigation projects.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How is all this relevant here? Is any portion of cloth used for irrigation projects?

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I was referring to the human factor.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid I will have to ask the hon. Member to conclude if he has nothing more to say. There is no use referring to all that. If he is referring to the human factor, khadi helps it. The argument seems to be in favour of khadi!

6 P.M.

Shri R. N. S. Deo: I will go to other factors. About khadi I can quite understand if you employ the Gandhian approach to the whole economic problem of the country but my objection is that you cannot take things piecemeal. (Interruptions) I submit that even with our Indian genius for synthesis even in a mixed economy, there are limits to what we can mix. We cannot possibly make *khichdi* out of pebbles of the paleolithic age, with the synthetic rice of the technological age. We can certainly make *khichdi* by substituting one kind of *dal* with another kind of *dal* and one kind of rice with another kind of rice. The two things must be of the same type. Our approach is wholly of a different type. You mix together two different things.

That is the fundamental objection to mixing up this thing with our present technological civilisation towards which we have already advanced so far. If we had to plan from the beginning and if we could plan on the other approach, I could well appreciate it and welcome this measure but now having gone so far, it is a point for consideration whether this thing will be at all economical. It has been suggested by some hon. Members that khadi is an economic proposition but if we have all the time to subsidise this industry, for all times to come we cannot call it an economic proposition. (Interruption) If by helping this industry for some time, you can make it stand on its legs, then, of course, it is in a different position; but if the ultimate outlook is that in any case this will go down—in this eternal struggle between machinery and man we have seen from the history of other countries also that the man has always gone down, machine has won. Even those machineries introduced with the object of labour-saving ultimately throw out of employment many people. In spite of all the industrial riots in England, the factories could not be abolished. Ultimately every hand spinning and weaving industry went down but now long are we going to keep alive this industry by subsidising?

Shri K. C. Sodhia: What is he driving at?

Shri R. N. S. Deo: With regard to another aspect also, I should like to utter a note of warning. Now, if some allocation is made for the improvement or encouragement of khadi out of the fund which will be available from this cess, then that part of the amount gets less for the handloom industry and what is the guarantee that the amount allocated for the improvement of khadi will actually lead to any beneficial results? I will just give you an example of what happens. I would draw your attention to a fact that happened in one of the States. In that State, for the improvement and encouragement of khadi, an hon. M.L.A., was appointed as honorary Khadi Adviser. Naturally he was appointed an honorary Adviser because if he had taken some salary, he would have become disqualified from M.L.A. ship. But he was given a palatial building to stay, two station wagons and a fantastic daily allowance and what is more, the capital of the State where the headquarters of the organisation was, was not considered to be headquarters for the purpose of his travelling allowance. His subdivisional headquarters where his village was made the headquarters so far as drawing of travelling allowance was concerned. Now by this means if the money meant for developmental purposes can be squandered away, then, it would not help either the khadi industry or the handloom industry. Therefore, I suggest that if khadi needs any encouragement, that should be treated on a separate footing. This should be confined purely to the handloom industry. I know that I have made my position clear. I have no intention of moving these similar amendments on the other clauses.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: If I am given the necessary time, I will now dispose of these three hon. gentlemen.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I do not want to waste the time of the House very much. I think this is the first time when we are trying to apply the provisions of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act. It would be worthwhile for this House.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Almost in every taxation measure this Provisional Collection of Taxes Act is applied to all cases. Even the Finance Bill, the hon. Member will see.....

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: In this particular case, this is a new Act

46 PSD

which is coming before this House. A new precedent is being created. A new tax is being imposed. It is the first precedent that we are creating in the new Parliament elected under adult suffrage. I would request the Members of this House and the Minister to see whether it is expedient and just to continue collection from the 15th February. I ask whether it would not be more reasonable and democratic to start collection from the 15th of May, that is, after the Bill is passed. This will avoid a bad precedent. That is all I want to submit.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will put all these amendments to the vote of the House.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: I want to say something.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member must have said so earlier.

An. Hon. Member: He opposed thrice.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: I want to say two sentences. That is all. I will not take more than five minutes. I would dispose of them all. There was a time when Gandhiji said that there were disbelievers of khadi in the country. They did not believe in khadi. If they could not believe then, they cannot believe in it now. This disposes of my hon. friend, the Maharaja. When that apostle was preaching khadi even then there were lakhs and lakhs of people who disbelieved in it and he had a soft heart for them. Similarly we have got a soft heart for the Maharaja and I will not spend my time over this.

As regards Dr. M. M. Das, he says that foreign yarn should not be used. That is one thing. The second thing is he wants to include wool. He wants to give encouragement to the woollen industry. As regards these two points, I say that handloom for many years to come will require foreign yarn in order to make it more attractive. If you want to encourage handloom industry, it ought to be made more attractive and how are you going to make it more attractive? You will find it very difficult. This disposes of Dr. M. M. Das. When our own industries are developed, we can ban foreign yarn.

While I have great respect for my hon. friend Bhargavaji, my submission is that the object of the Bill is not to encourage power. The object is to encourage each individual human machine. That was the object for which Mahatma Gandhi gave his blessings to handloom, because, it gave food to five or six crores of our villagers. That

[Shri K. C. Sodhia]

number may be something less today. But, it is a big enough number. Power loom cannot take the place of handloom and it cannot give food to so many people. If at all, it can give food only to a few people who can invest Rs. 30,000 or 50,000 or 10,000.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: On a point of order, Sir. Is the hon. Member speaking on any of these amendments?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is speaking about Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's amendment.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: This argument does not appeal to me. I always believe in the principle of greatest good to the greatest number. That is my argument. I have nothing more to say.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The point raised by the hon. Member Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava is covered by clause 5 (2) (e) where we proposed to exempt from the whole or any part of the duty of excise levied under this Act any variety of cloth which is for the time being exempt from the duty of excise imposed under the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944. Under the Central Excises and Salt Act, Government is not levying any excise on power loom cloth. It is the intention that this Act should be administered in the same manner. The exemptions will be the same as are granted under the Central Excises Act. I think my hon. friend will be satisfied.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: In view of this statement, I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I have an amendment No. 14. It is a small amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am afraid it is too late now. I looked this side also. The hon. Member was not in his seat.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): There is one point. I wish to know, when the enacting clause says that a tax is leviable, whether a rule-making power can exempt a particular thing. No doubt, it provides for that.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The legal conscience of my hon. friend need not be injured. The fact is, in any revenue producing measure, the question of exemption is left to the collecting authority. That is the

general provision. That power is inherent in the Government. They cannot enhance the duty. But, the question of exemption and lowering of the duty is left to the Government. We have merely enacted so far the levying of certain duties. So far as exemption of power looms is concerned, it would be administratively impossible. That is why discretion is left with the Government. That is why it is mentioned there. That fact that we have mentioned it as part of the rule-making power is enough justification for Government taking that power, and an indication is given to the House that it may be done. I do not think there is anything wrong in that procedure because that is the procedure followed really in regard to all revenue measures.

Shri Raghavachari: Do I understand that because an exemption rule is provided, it inferentially means that the tax is not leviable on these things?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The position is, under the Central Excises Act mentioned, that power is there inherent in the Government. This is merely reference to it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I understand the hon. Member to say that because in the body of the Bill no such provision is made, incidentally, indirectly it ought not to be brought under the rule-making power.

Shri Raghavachari: Yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This question has been considered on a number of occasions. The hon. Member will kindly see that under clause 5, rules can be made for carrying out the purposes of the Act. Sub-clause (2) says:

"In particular, and without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing power, such rules may provide for....."

Let us take sub-clause (e)

"the exemption from the wholeetc."

That has been taken to be both a substantive rule and as being in the body of the Act. On various occasions, this point has come up before the House.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: One minute, Sir. I will explain my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No. It has not been moved.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): Sir, the point is this.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point in this. I have tried to explain the position.

The question is:

In page 1, line 8, for "15th day of February, 1953" substitute "15th day of May, 1953."

The motion was negatived.

Dr. M. M. Das: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In view of the statement of the hon. Member Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, has he the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment?

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 1, omit lines 16 and 17.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 1, line 15, omit "khadi or other".

The motion was negatived.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: One minute, Sir. The language of the definition is defective. There will be great difficulties in enforcing the law.

The definition says:

"handloom cloth, means any cloth woven from any material including silk, artificial silk, staple fibre and wool, on looms worked by manual labour."

As you know, Sir, it is not woven only of each of these fibres separately; there is a mixture of them, mixture of wool and cotton, cotton and artificial silk, silk and wool and so on.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Where is it said exclusively?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: That is why I am saying.....

Shri Venkataraman (Tanjore): The word 'including' is there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing to prevent. Where there is silk and wool, it comes under the definition.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: The words 'or any mixture' are necessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It always includes mixture.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: No. We lawyers know that it does not.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Any way, Government does not accept it.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is unnecessary.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill"

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.—(Levy of additional duty etc.)

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair: I beg to move:

In page 2, lines 4 and 5, for "on cloth which is exported out of India" substitute "on coarse and medium cloth".

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I beg to move:

In page 2, line 2, after "thereto" insert:

"whether it has been sold or delivered to any party subsequent to the appointed day".

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I beg to move:

In page 1, line 20, after "day" insert "in any factory".

Shri Vallatharas (Pudukkottai): My amendment is:

In page 2, line 3, for "three pies" substitute "one pie".

Shri Raghavaiah (Ongole): I want to move amendment No. 18.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Amendment No. 18 is already disposed of.

Shri Raghavaiah: I refer to amendment No. 18 in List No. 3.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All the amendments have been numbered, whatever be the clause, in serial order. No. 18 has already been disposed of. Amendment No. 18 refers to clause 2.

Shri Raghavaiah: It is for clause 3. It is No. 18 in List No. 3.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him read it.

Shri Raghavaiah: I beg to move:
In page 1, line 18,

(i) after "additional" insert
"differential"; and

(ii) after "excise on" insert
"varieties of".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is No. 21. So the amendments moved are Nos. 21, 22, 23, 26.....

Shri Vallatharas: I am not pressing my amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So, that is not moved.

Amendments moved:

(1) In page 1, line 18.

(i) after "additional" insert
"differential"; and

(ii) after "excise on" insert
"varieties of".

(2) In page 1, line 20, after "day"
insert "in any factory".

(3) In page 2, line 2, after
"thereto" insert:

"whether it has been sold or
delivered to any party subsequent
to the appointed day".

(4) In page 2, lines 4 and 5, for
"on cloth which is exported out of
India" substitute "on coarse and
medium cloth".

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: In moving my amendment I want to plug a loophole in clause 3. You will be pleased to see that the first Bill was dated the 28th October, 1952. The present Bill is dated 11th February, 1953. Now, clause 3 reads like this:

"There shall be levied and collected on all cloth manufactured on or after the appointed day in the territories to which this Act extends and on all cloth lying in stock on the appointed day in any factory where cloth is manufactured or in any premises appurtenant thereto, a duty of excise at the rate of..."

Supposing the mill owners say that during the period between the introduction of the first Bill and the present Bill, they have sold, is the excise duty going to be levied on that or not?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: We did not introduce the first Bill and put into it the clause that we have here, "Declaration under the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, 1931." So, the question of the first Bill does not arise. So far as this particular Bill is concerned, the tax is being collected and the conundrum mentioned by the hon. Member has already arisen and has been disposed of, and I do not think it need be met now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, he does not press his amendment.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I do not want to take too much time of the House. I only want to point out that exemption of duty on exported cloth is very unfair to the people of India, and only favourable to the exporters. I also wish to point out a mistake. The complaint of the South Indian mill owners is that the export licences are issued so fast that they do not get a share of the licences, as the people in Bombay and other places who are near are able to. The competition is so keen among the exporters and producers that it is evident that the profits must be very high, and this has been brought to the notice of the House also in the Auditor-General's report that the exported cloth brought very high prices, and it continues even now. So I submit that the exported cloth should also be taxed.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: On one point, the hon. Member is wrong. Licensing is free. Anybody can get a licence. Nobody is refused licence so far as export of cloth is concerned. It is free. It has to be given. There is an office even in Cochin where licences will be given. There is no quota restriction, no quantitative restriction.

In regard to levy on exports, we have an export duty on cloth, and when we want to tax, we levy an export duty. All internal excises are exempted. It is the normal rule. The Central excise that we levy on cloth is not levied on exported cloth. So, it just follows the practice that no excise duty is levied on exports, and when we want to levy a tax, it is the export duty that is levied.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: In regard to my amendment, the statement made by the hon. Minister is

quite sufficient for me, and I do not press it. In view of the statement that power will be exempted, handloom cloth and Khadi and similar cloth will also be exempted, I do not want to press my amendment, and I want leave to withdraw it.

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): I have nothing more to say, but there is one point, because the hon. Minister has provided that on all cloth the rate of duty will be three pies per yard, whether the cloth costs four annas per yard or Rs. ten a yard, and again, whether the width of the cloth is 20 inches or 24 inches or 70 inches.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Ninety inches.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Or 90 inches. So, I have not been able to suggest any amendment. It would have been better examined at the Select Committee stage. However, I hope that the hon. Minister would get it examined, because the bulk of the cloth that is being used by the poor classes costs less, whereas the costly cloth is being used by the higher classes, and that will also be levied at the same rate. So, this point needs further examination. I am glad, again, here there is a provision that no such duty shall be levied on...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it three pies per square yard?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No. Sir, Running yard.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: Had it been levied on area, I think there would have been some uniformity, but there is no uniformity here.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikattara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Three pies per rupee would be a sensible suggestion.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The adjustments are made by these Central excises where we levy Re. 0-3-3 on superfine cloth under the new adjustment that has been made by the hon. Finance Minister. Here, this particular tax is going to be there for all time, and there may come a time when we will not have Central excise on cloth. But this will be there. The cess that we levy must be administratively collected. If the administrative charges, that have to be incurred by reason of the fact that when there is no Central excise we have got to collect it, are higher than the purpose will be defeated. So, it is an administrative matter. That is why we have a flat rate. Any adjustment of the burden is being carried out by

the differential rates levied by the Excise Department. In the circumstances, I submit that this burden does not fall unduly on the coarser or cheaper variety of cloth.

An Hon. Member: We could not understand.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: There is need for a provision that no such duty shall be levied on cloth which is exported out of India.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That I have said already. There is no point in raising it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already explained it. Whenever export duty is levied, this excise duty is not added to the export duty. Either the one or the other is charged.

Shri Raghavaiah: Before I deal with my amendment, I may just appeal to the hon. Minister to consider the question of differential cess being levied on different varieties of cloth.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is what he said. The same thing was argued by Mr. Vyas, and answered also. The hon. Minister says it is not administratively convenient. I have no objection if the hon. Member wishes to stress the same point. The hon. Member might have stood up earlier. That is all my point.

Shri Raghavaiah: I do not wish to say anything except just that an assurance may be given by the hon. Minister to the majority of the people, because after all, fine and superfine cloth is not put on by the majority of the population of the country. That is put on only by a minor section. I would only appeal that all varieties of cloth excluding fine and superfine should be exempted from the levy of this cess. You know, how even the officials in the district collectorate and other offices could not get seven yard dhotis even in the best available days. So, I just only appeal to the hon. Minister that apart from consideration of administrative and other inconveniences, he should bear in mind that we are representing here a majority of the population. It is by their votes that we have come. The votes with which we have come here should not be ignored. That is my appeal, and I hope the hon. Minister will do justice to the majority of the population through whose votes he has also come here as a Member of the House, and has also become a member of the Cabinet. And I hope that the hon. Minister will do justice to the majority of the people

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Does the hon. Minister want to say anything?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have explained the position already.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the amendments one by one to the vote of the House.

The question is:

In page 1, line 18,

- (i) after "additional" insert "differential"; and
- (ii) after "excise on" insert "varieties of".

The motion was negatived.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: I would like to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the amendment in the name of Mr. Sreekantan Nair, to the vote of the House.

The question is:

In page 2, lines 4 and 5, for "on cloth which is exported out of India" substitute "on coarse and medium cloth".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4.—(Application of proceeds)

Shri Kachiroyar (Cuddalore): I beg to move:

In page 2, for lines 11 to 15, substitute:

"4. Application of proceeds.—The Central Government shall distribute the net proceeds of the duty of excise levied under this Act to the States in proportion to the number of handlooms existing in each State for generally meeting the cost of such measures as if

considers necessary or expedient to take for developing khadi and other handloom industries, including measures for."

Dr. M. M. Das: I beg to move:

In page 2, line 11, for "may" substitute "shall".

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: I beg to move:

In page 2, line 16, after "encouraging" insert:

"hand spinning and manufacturing of".

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): I beg to move:

In page 2, line 17, after "handloom industries" and:

"including grant of reasonable subsidies to the producing worker with ten or less looms of his own."

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I beg to move:

In page 2, line 19, after "cloth" add:

"which will lead to further reduction in cost of production, including apparatus for making long warps, sizing, bleaching, calendering etc."

Shri Nambiar: I beg to move:

(i) In page 2, line 24, after "handloom industries" add:

"including distribution of unemployment doles to the workers."

(ii) In page 2, line 26, after "handloom cloth" add:

"including that of organising Government's purchase of the accumulated stock and sale at reduced prices on Government subsidy."

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): I beg to move:

In page 2, after line 30, insert:

"(h) supplying raw materials and yarn at cheap rates to the khadi and handloom workers, co-operative societies and organisations and safeguarding the

interests of the khadi and handloom industries against the competition of mill made cloth."

Shri Kachiroyar: I beg to move:

In page 2, after line 30, insert:

"(h) making available adequate supply of yarn made of Indian cotton at reasonable rates direct from the mills to handloom industries."

Shri Raghavaiah: I beg to move:

In page 2, after line 30, insert:

"(h) giving unemployment relief to weavers and spinners in the industries."

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): I beg to move:

In page 2, after line 30, insert:

"(h) giving immediate relief to the unemployed workers of handloom factories and those previously employed by master weavers;

(i) enabling Government to purchase the handloom products at a reasonable price and sell them through Government agencies."

Shri Damodara Meun (Kozhikode): I beg to move:

In page 2, after line 30, insert:

"(h) banning of production of mill cloth of certain varieties, kinds and designs and also of particular counts of yarn and also reserving the production of the same through khadi and handloom cloth."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All these amendments are now before the House.

Dr. M. M. Das: My amendment is a very simple one which seeks to substitute the word "shall" for the word "may" in page 2, line 11. Although it is a very small amendment, the implications of this amendment are very wide. The clause as it stands in this Bill does not make it compulsory or incumbent on the part of the Government of India to spend all the money derived from the imposition

of this tax; it leaves it to the Government to spend any money for any purpose other than that for which this cess has been levied. In other words, it may be that the Government may spend a fraction of the income from this tax for the development of the khadi and handloom industries, and the remaining portion may be appropriated to the general revenues.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The word "may" means "shall" or "must" here?

Pandit K. C. Sharma (Meerut Dist.—South): the word "may" here means that Government have the legal power. It is a legal terminology.

Dr. M. M. Das: I have got another doubt in my mind. The term "cess" has been converted into "excise duty" in this Bill, by the withdrawal of the previous Bill and the introduction of the present Bill. (Interruptions). With my limited knowledge of public finance I understand that there is a wide difference between the meaning of the term 'cess' and the term 'excise duty'. The term 'cess' means a tax for a particular purpose, that is, the revenue from a cess cannot be spent for any purpose other than that for which it has been imposed. No such condition is attached to excise duty. Excise duty is part of the general revenue and, therefore, can be spent for any purpose.

There is another difference. The proceeds from a cess cannot be appropriated to the general revenue, whereas excise duty is a part of the general revenue. This change from the 'cess' to 'excise duty' has got a very wide and important implication because it empowers the Government to spend the proceeds from this tax for any purpose. This is also corroborated by this fact that in clause 4 it is stated: "The Central Government may utilise...". Why not 'shall utilise'? If that is not the purpose of the Government, if Government does not contemplate to utilise, if any occasion arises, a part of the revenue derived from this duty for other purposes, then what is the objection of the Government to accept my amendment? So that if my amendment is accepted, the clause will read thus:

"The Central Government shall utilise the net proceeds of the duty of excise levied under this Act...".

Members of this House have given their wholehearted support and approval to this measure because we know that every pie from the proceeds of this tax will be spent for the development of two of our very important industries—the khadi industry and

[Dr. M. M. Das.]

the handloom industry. If our Government want to increase their revenue, there are so many other ways left open to them. Therefore, I think my amendment is very important and I hope this House will accept it.

Shri Punnoose: My amendment speaks for itself. I will not take much time of the House. On the application of the proceeds, we have got sub-clauses (a) to (g). To these I would add (h) and (i). If you look into the application of proceeds clause, you will find vague declarations, brave words and very valuable intentions. But I would like to submit, that all those are of no practical importance unless you give immediate relief to the lakhs of people who are hit by the crisis in this industry.

The hon. Minister was labouring long and hard on all economic problems and on philosophical implications. But unless some relief is immediately given to the worker who is starving, this is not going to gain anything for the masses of our people.

I am also afraid that the intention of canvassing votes for the hon. Minister's party in the next General Election on the merits of this legislation is also going to fall flat because the number of Bills and speeches will not cut ice with the people. Are we in a position to give them bread and work? That is the question. I think that unless my amendment is accepted and the responsibility of giving immediate relief to the thousands of unemployed workers is shouldered by Government, this Bill is not going to be of any importance to them. The hon. Commerce Minister stated a number of intentions. They are very good ones. But I am afraid he is prescribing tonics and soups, to a patient whose condition is horrible. The immediate task is to give him some medicine and save him from the grips of death. Then let us think about these soups and tonics. You are talking about encouragement, promotion and all that. There is no encouragement, no promotion, unless these lakhs of people are put on their feet.

Shri V. P. Nayar (Chirayinkil): I support the amendment moved by comrade Punnoose. In doing so, I am positive that this amendment is absolutely necessary, having regard to the working of laws as we have seen. This amendment is necessary also be-

cause, you find that although there are in the Title, the words—

“for the purpose of developing khadi and other handloom industries and for promoting the sale of khadi” etc.,

no specific provision has been made for the distribution of the amount or the ways and means by which the industry will be resurrected.

We know from our experience, that provisions in such disjointed legislation, will not do any good in ameliorating the situation which has been the result of the gross mismanagement of affairs by the Government. We also know that Government in bringing forward this legislation has only attempted to have a whitewash at the top without going into the fundamentals of the question.

Why is it that the handloom industry faces a crisis today? That question has not been tackled. You know that in the cost structure of yarn, about 50 per cent. will be the share of the price of raw cotton. How is it that during war time, during the period of peak inflation which we have had, yarn was available, say of 20 counts, at Rs. 12/8 per bundle and now is it that today it is Rs. 20 or Rs. 21? This Government has not tackled that question, because they have not been able to cope with the demand for raw cotton in the country from internal sources.

You know that after partition, the import of cotton became an absolute necessity. It was not possible for them to improve the cotton production of the country and the figures supplied by the Government show that there has been a progressive decline in the per acre yield of cotton. That has led to the present crisis in the industry. You know also that raw cotton trade is in the hands of certain people whom the Minister himself once called as cut throat traders

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How are all these things relevant? How are these general observations about raw cotton being in the hands of money-lenders etc., relevant?

Shri V. P. Nayar: I submit to your ruling, Sir. This is relevant in view of the amendment suggested.

I also remember that one or two years before, you yourself quoted the

portion of a *sloka* from Kalidasa's *Raghuvarusa*:

त्यागय संभूतार्थां म्

I would like to quote the words which follow your quotation:

सत्याय भित्तमषिणाम्

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How does it all arise? There is no running a coach and four here. I must close the whole debate at seven o'clock.

Shri V. P. Nayar: This provision is necessary, because without this amendment even if the cess collected comes to Rs. one crore or Rs. two crores, it may not mean any substantial benefit to the people concerned. In my State, I have seen some 10,000 looms in a small area of two or three square miles around Balaramapuram. I have had occasion to tour such places in the early forties in connection with a Government work. At that time, I found a flourishing centre there. Last year, I had occasion to visit the very same places Balaramapuram, Nemom, Pallichal, Aralumood etc. along with an hon. Member of the Upper House and Kumari Annie Mascarene of this House. Hundreds of looms were lying idle. Is it enough that Government collects one or two crores of rupees and spends the amount as it pleases? That is not the way. If you calculate, it will not come to even a rupee or two per loom. These looms have been lying idle and the mass of cobwebs we saw, bore eloquent testimony to their continued idle state. We enquired about the reasons, and were told that the weavers could not buy yarn, because the price was such—so high. In my State where the rainfall is very heavy, we find that in many places the thatched roofs covering the looms had fallen over them and the people had no means to raise even the thatched sheds. That is the situation.

After all, we know how the administrative machinery of this Government functions. It is not only outmoded but out of gear also. It is the administrative machinery that has to administer this law, because no provision of law has a separate and independent existence.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that may be a very interesting, but it is irrelevant. He was supporting Mr. Punnoose's amendment. That amendment refers in part (h) to immediate relief to the unemployed and in part (l) to enabling of Government to purchase handloom products. I doubt if part (h) is in order.

46 PSD

Shri V. P. Nayar: It was not ruled out of order when moved.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At any time, I can do so.

Shri V. P. Nayar: In that case, I shall speak on part (i). Part (h) urges the necessity for affording immediate relief to the unemployed persons.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the amendment is not in order, what is the good of suggesting it? I rule part (h) out of order.

Shri Punnoose: The Bill refers to developing the handloom industry and this is a part of it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Part (h) is out of order.

Shri V. P. Nayar: I shall confine myself to part (i). There is no use starting fantastic schemes in the imagination of people. We must get down to some concrete thing. Some of us come from places where the misery is acute. There the position about the looms is that starvation is looming large. The amendment of my hon. friend is necessary, because it will not be possible even with the cess to do anything with the present administrative machinery. The whole industry is prostrate. You cannot help them in this way by lending a helping hand and getting them to sit up, let alone the question of making them standing erect. Therefore, I submit that the amendment of my hon. friend Mr. Punnoose must be in the statute book.

Shri Raghavaiah: My amendment relates to the relief to be given to the unemployed in the textile industry and to the handloom weavers.

Pandit K. C. Sharma: The Chair has ruled it out of order.

Shri Raghavaiah: Yesterday during the general discussion I pointed out that owing to the reservation of certain varieties for the textile industry a large number of workers in the weaving section will be unemployed. This fact was admitted yesterday. I do not know how it becomes out of order overnight, as has been suggested by an hon. Member on the other side. In this connection the suggestion made by Mr. Somani that both the textile mill industry as also the handloom industry should be allowed to go into full production is certainly worth commending.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry what I said with respect to Mr. Punnoose's first part of the amendment

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

(h) applies to Mr. Raghavaiah's amendment also, that is, giving unemployment relief to weavers and spinners. It may be a very laudable object, but it is not within the scope of the Bill. This amendment is out of order. It is no good beating a dead horse.

Shri Raghavaiah: Then, I would like to say a few words on my amendment No. 70 in the Consolidated List.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry it was not moved.

Shri Nambiar: I have moved three amendments.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: His amendment regarding unemployment doles is out of order.

Shri Nambiar: I do not wish to traverse the ground which has already been covered by the previous speakers. All I wish to say is that in Tamilnad and other districts of South India the problem has become so acute that several hundreds and thousands of handlooms had to close down and the weavers had to take to begging. This is a fact which anybody will admit. Under these circumstances unless some immediate relief is granted to them there is no chance of this industry surviving. That is why I have come forward with a specific suggestion that weavers of the lower category, that is those having ten or less looms of their own must be given some subsidy, either in the form of doles or in the form of reduced prices for the yarn.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: The hon. Member wants doles?

Shri Nambiar: I want that immediate help should reach the people—call it doles or whatever you like. If the hon. Member has any other method to suggest I have no objection to accept it. You know the position throughout the South. It is therefore time that something is done. I have indicated a method.

I have to make a specific suggestion and I hope the hon. Minister will consider it. They say they are going to get Rs. five crores out of this. It may not be possible to distribute these Rs. five crores to all the handloom weavers. But they can so arrange it that the produce can be purchased by Government—which, of course, an hon. Member has suggested—and they can give subsidies so that the loss may be borne by Government and the worker who produces the cloth will get something. Today either the price of yarn must be reduced or the price of cloth must be increased. If the price

of cloth is increased it cannot be sold in the market because of the low purchasing power of the people. Therefore, the only solution is that Government must come into the picture and help them. If by this way they can find Rs. five crores, we will grant them another Rs. five crores apart from that. If they can find some other method for it, let them do it. Otherwise, whatever money they will realise by this they will spend on other things. There will be a Board, officers will be appointed on high salaries and allowances, there will be some publicity and propaganda that handloom cloth must be purchased. It is a very nice cloth, etc. The money will be spent on superfluous things like that and no aid will go to the producer or the persons practically affected. That situation must be avoided and whatever money is realised should go for their aid.

Therefore I am making a concrete suggestion through my amendments. If you consider, Sir, that my amendment which refers to doles does not come within the scope of this Bill, there is the other amendment in which I have suggested organising of Government's purchase. In this respect practical help must be rendered. And if they want more money, we on this side will support the Government in that respect, in finding more money. There will be no question about that, because this is a life and death struggle of millions of people not only in the South but throughout the country, and therefore something concrete must be done.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: With regard to amendment No. 100, I would like to know from Mr. Damodara Menon or Mr. Raghavachari—I would like the hon. Minister also to see it—how this amendment, which refers to banning of production of mill cloth, is in order.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I cannot understand how in the application of the proceeds the Central Government can utilise the net proceeds of the duty etc. for banning of production of mill cloth.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I consider this amendment to be out of order. Let me hear Mr. Raghavachari also. The whole scheme of the Bill is imposition of an excise duty and application of the proceeds.

Shri Raghavachari: I would refer to the words "and, in particular, measures for".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All these items (a) to (g) refer only to application of proceeds.

Shri Raghavachari: But really the whole matter is that...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is true that this is one of the very good methods that can be suggested, but independently of the Bill. Therefore, this amendment is out of order.

Shri Raghavachari: There is one point...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have to race against time. And by no stretch of imagination can this amendment be in order.

Shri Raghavachari: I will submit to you how it is relevant. The purpose of this amendment is to have drawn out spheres of production, demarcate areas of production. How can it be done? One of the suggestions we place before the House is that...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The purpose of the Bill is not to demarcate.

Shri Raghavachari: Banning certain varieties of cloth.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is not improving the situation at all.

Shri Raghavachari: I perfectly agree that it may not appropriately go as one of the sub-clauses under clause 4 and that it requires to be an independent clause. Clause 4A is also there. I might be permitted to support that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I rule that this is out of order.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: So far as an independent clause is concerned, this cannot be ruled out without hearing the author of the clause, that is, myself.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: So far as the amendment is concerned, it is out of order.

Shri Venkataraman: I want to support the first amendment of Shri Kachiroyar. The scheme of the Bill is that the administration of the funds should be vested in the Central Government. The amendment suggested by him is that the money should be transferred to the respective State Governments in proportion to the looms so that they may be administered by the State Governments. My points are very simple. Firstly, there would be economy in administration if it is administered by the State Government. Secondly, my

point is that if the proceeds are transferred to the respective States in proportion to the looms which are existing in each one of those States, it would be...

An Hon. Member: Looms can be licensed.

Shri Venkataraman: I do not think you are going to administer this without licensing looms. It would be in the best interests of the persons whom we seek to protect if we transfer these funds to the respective States. By doing this there would be economy in administration. There would be expedition in administration. In fact it would lead to decentralisation and all these handloom weavers will be protected. Suppose the Central Government spends all the money in one of the States which has not got a large number of weavers, while thousands of handloom weavers are dispersed over a few States. I know very well that the handloom weavers are largely concentrated only in Madras, in a part of Assam and in a part of Madhya Pradesh. Therefore, my submission is that this is a very necessary amendment. I support this.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: I support all that Mr. Venkataraman said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House has agreed to conclude discussions at seven. We will finish this Bill. Therefore, I will now put all the amendments.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: I want to oppose an amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have had enough of discussion in this matter.

The question is:

In page 2, for lines 11 to 15, substitute:

"4. Application of proceeds.—The Central Government shall distribute the net proceeds of the duty of excise levied under this Act to the States in proportion to the number of handlooms existing in each State for generally meeting the cost of such measures as it considers necessary or expedient to take for developing khadi and other handloom industries, including measures for."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 11, for "may" substitute "shall"

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 16, after "encouraging" insert.

"hand spinning and manufacturing of".

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 17, after "handloom industries" add:

"including grant of reasonable subsidies to the producing worker with ten or less looms of his own."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 19, after "cloth" add:

"which will lead to further reduction in cost of production, including apparatus for making long warps, sizing, bleaching calendering etc."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, line 26, after "handloom cloth" add:

"including that of organising Government's purchase of the accumulated stock and sale at reduced prices on Government subsidy."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, after line 30, insert:

"(h) supplying raw materials and yarn at cheap rates to the khadi and handloom workers, co-operative societies and organisations and safeguarding the interests of the khadi and handloom industries against the competition of mill made cloth."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, after line 30 insert:

"(h) making available adequate supply of yarn made of Indian cotton at reasonable rates direct from the mills to handloom industries."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

In page 2, after line 30 insert:

"(h) giving immediate relief to the unemployed workers of handloom factories and those previously employed by master weavers,

(i) enabling Government to purchase the handloom products at a reasonable price and sell them through Government agencies."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Shri K. C. Sodhia: What about new clauses?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nothing more.

The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

The House then adjourned till Two of the Clock on Friday, the 10th April, 1953.