

But so long as that reconsideration has not taken place, we will go by this programme.

### REPORT OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

#### SIXTH REPORT ON THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

**Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati):** I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Food and Agriculture.

### MUSLIM WAKFS BILL

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

**The Minister of Law and Minority Affairs (Shri Biswas):** I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for the better governance and administration of Muslim Wakfs and the supervision of Mutawallis' management of them, in India, be further extended upto the last day of the first week of the next session."

**Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour):** This is the fourth or fifth time that the extension is being asked for. May we know the reasons for the same?

**Shri Biswas:** The reason is this. As a matter of fact, the Select Committee held several meetings.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam):** And no quorum.

**Shri Biswas:** The first two meetings were without quorum, but in subsequent meetings, there was a quorum, but then these meetings were interrupted first by the Diwali holidays, and then by the consideration of the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, and that occupied the whole of the time till yesterday. So there was no time to

go on with this Bill, and there was also little chance of this Bill being taken up and passed this session. Therefore, naturally, we gave priority to the other Bill, viz. the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the House take it that this is the final application for extension?

**Shri Biswas:** That is the intention.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for the better governance and administration of Muslim Wakfs and the supervision of Mutawallis' management of them, in India, be further extended upto the last day of the first week of the next session."

*The motion was adopted.*

### DHOTIES (ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTY) BILL

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now proceed with further consideration of the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of an additional excise duty on dhoties issued out of mills in excess of the quota fixed for the purpose.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

**Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South):** Sir, my misfortune is that the hon. Minister does not understand the national language in which I propose to speak.

**Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour):** Even if he understands, the matter won't improve.

पंडित डी० एन० तिवारी: कन्द-  
मिलनों में यह विधेयक पास हो जायेगा  
और कानून बन जायेगा, लेकिन  
सायब सब लोगों ने इस के फायदे  
की बातें ऐफेक्ट्स पर गौर नहीं किया है।

[पंडित डी० एन० तिवारी]

इसका असर दूर तक जायेगा और लोगों को कैसे एफेक्ट करेगा इस पर स्यामद मिनिस्टर साहब ने काफी गौर नहीं किया है या फिर किसी चकमे में पड़ गये हैं।

इस बिल ने जितना इस तरफ के लोगों को उद्बेलित किया है उतना शायद कि सी दूसरे बिल ने नहीं किया था। लोगों को आशा थी कि गवर्नमेंट ऐसी नीति बरतेगी जिस में हैडलूम इन्डस्ट्री को प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा, और इस बिना पर उन लोगों को खुशी हुई थी कि कम से कम देर कर के सही, आनरेबल मिनिस्टर ने ४० परसेंट घोषितियों के लिये हैडलूम को छूट दी थी। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि एक हाथ से जिस छूट को दिया गया था, और दूसरे हाथ से उसको ले लिया जा रहा है। यदि बिल के प्रिन्सिपल को देखा जाय तो उस में क्या यह बिल लाया गया लिसा हुआ है।

"to provide for the levy and collection of an additional excise duty on dhoties issued out of mills in excess of the quota fixed for the purpose."

इसलिये मैं नहीं आया कि जो कानून बनाया गया, जो आडर उन्होंने पास किया उस को सारे देश में मान्यता मिले, या मिल वाले उस को मानें। लेकिन यह इस लिये आया कि बूकि उन लोगों ने इस कानून को नहीं माना, उनकी बातों को नहीं माना तो उस पर कैसे परदा डाला जाय। किस तरह से उनके गुनाहों को छिपाया जाय इसी लिये यह बिल आया है। कहा जाता है कि जो पहले का एसेम्बल सप्लाइंग ऐक्ट है उस के पेनैल्टी क्लॉज पर इस बिल का अठर नहीं होता है। पेनैल्टी क्लॉज में क्या है जरा गौर करें।

"(a) he shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years and shall also be liable to fine,

(b) any property in respect of which the order has been contravened or such part thereof as to the court may seem fit shall be forfeited to the Government."

मैं जानता साहूंगा कि इस कानून की उद्दल हुकमी के लिये क्या कार्यवाई की गई। बूकि मिल वालों का एक बहुत बड़ा संगठन है और उनकी पब्लिश सेक्रेटैरियट के बड़े बड़े हुक्कामों तक है और वे किसी भी ऐसे कानून को, जो कि उनके पसन्द का न हो, सर्कम्बेन्ट करके कैसे फेल करा देंगे हैं, और कैसे उसके असर को दूर किया जाता है, इस को अच्छी तरह जानते हैं। इस लिये हमारे आनरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब भी उन के चकमे में आ गये। उन्होंने यह नहीं सोचा

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): He is not following what you are saying.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krlahnamachari): It will go into print.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: That is the misfortune. Nor will he try to learn it (Interruption).

मैं कह रहा था कि कानून को किस तरह से बेकार बनाया जाता है इस को बिल वाले खून अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। यह कमी नहीं देखा गया है कि ये सरमायेदार लोग मानवता बरतने पर रिपेक्ट अच्छी तरह से करते हैं। उनके ऊपर जब पाबन्दी रहेगी, उन पर जब कड़ाई की जायेगी तभी वह सीधे रह सकते हैं अन्यथा सौजन्यता का जवाब वह बुद्धता से ही देते हैं। वे इसका तरीका अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि कानूनों को सर्कम्बेन्ट करके कैसे उसको

बेकार कर दिया जाय। मैं नहीं समझता कि क्यों गवर्नमेन्ट आफ इंडिया ने भी इस कानून को ला कर यह साबित किया है कि उनके अन्दर इतनी शक्ति नहीं है कि वह इस कानून को लागू करा सकें। हमें बहुत अफसोस है कि हमारी गवर्नमेन्ट इस बिल के इस अंश पर निगाह नहीं करती। असो कानून बना और उसके बनने पर उसका यह विचार था कि वह हैन्डलूम इन्डस्ट्री को मदद करेगी। पर मिल मालिक वह चाहते कि हैन्डलूम इन्डस्ट्री को फेल कराया जाय। इस पर गवर्नमेन्ट का क्या हल होना चाहिए इसी को उन्होंने समझा नहीं है। सब से बड़ी बात तो यह थी . . . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whatever the hon. Member has said so far has already been said. I will request him to confine his remarks in the third reading.....

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: No, Sir. Perhaps the Chair has not followed me.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am able to follow Hindi thoroughly well.

मैं खूब हिन्दी जानता हूँ और समझता हूँ।

Just now I have been following the hon. Member I can speak in Hindi also. So let him not say that.

Now, he has not said a word over what has been said already. Very well. He may go on. Let him confine his remarks to what is proper in the third reading stage.

पंडित डी० एन० तिवारी : सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि इन्डस्ट्रियल पालिसी या टेक्स्टाइल पालिसी को कैसे शुरू किया जाय कि हमारे गृह उद्योगों को फायदा हो। वह पालिसी कारगर ट्यूक बाम रही है। गांधी जी का ध्येय था कि हिन्दुस्तान में कम से कम कपड़े की व्यवस्था ऐसी कर दी जाय जिस में कपड़ा मिल में नहीं बल्कि खादी या हैंड लूम इन्डस्ट्री में तदार होने लगे

उनका सपना था कि सारा भारतवर्ष लादी मय हो जाय। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरफ क्या कदम बढ़ाया गया है। अब तक कौन सी ऐसी कार्यवाही की गई कि इस ध्येय की प्राप्ति हो सके। इस गवर्नमेन्ट को भी आफिस में आये हुए १८ महीने हो गये; १८ महीने का समय कम नहीं है। अगर हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब समझते हैं कि कुछ टैक्स लगा कर, कुछ रुपया वसूल करके हैंड लूम इन्डस्ट्री को दे दिया जाय, कुछ पैसा उनको मिल जाय, और उनकी सहायता हो जायेगी तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कुछ बान्दी के टुकड़ों से कोई इन्डस्ट्री बढ़ती नहीं है। जब तक कि कोई इन्ट्रिपेटेड पालिसी, कोई स्कीम देश व्यापी रूप में न हो, तब तक कोई इन्डस्ट्री बढ़ नहीं सकती और हैंड लूम इन्डस्ट्री तो मिलों के कम्पिटिशन में कभी नहीं टिक सकती यदि उनका संरक्षण न हो।

उसका एक ही इलाज है कि कुछ कपड़े के किस्म रिजर्व कर दिये जाते जो मिल वाले न बना सकते। यहाँ के कुछ सदस्यों ने इसी वजह से इस हाउस में एक रेजोल्यूशन दिया था कि धोती का फुल कोटा रिजर्व कर दिया जाय। लेकिन वह रेजोल्यूशन हाउस में आ न सका। फिर भी हम लोग खुश थे कि कम से कम ४० पर सेंट तो रिजर्व किया गया। मैं मिनिस्टर साहब का ध्यान इस तरफ दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि वह एक देशव्यापी नीति ऐसी निर्धारित करें जिससे कि हैंड लूम और क्लडर को प्रोत्साहन मिल सके।

एक बात कही गई वह समय में नहीं आई। कुछ बंगाल के सदस्यों ने और हमारे बालरेबिल मिनिस्टर ने भी कहा कि बंगाल में कुछ ऐसी मिलें हैं जिनकी हासल बच्ची नहीं है और वह रिफ्यूजीय की बिस्स

[पंडित डी० एन० तिवारी ]

हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उनको मदद करने का यही तरीका है कि उनको बह छूट दे दी जाय कि कानून तोड़ा करें और हमारी बातों को न मानें। क्या कोई दूसरा तरीका नहीं है कि उनको मदद दी जा सके। आप उनको रुपया दें या कर्ज दें और इस तरह उनको मदद करके आगे बढ़ावें। कोई भी आदमी जो मदद के लायक हो उसको मदद देनी ही चाहिए लेकिन इस तरह से नहीं कि कानून भिन्न करवाकर उसको मदद दी जाये। तो यह दलील, कि कुछ मित्र अभी अच्छी हालत में नहीं हैं, टिकती नहीं है।

एक बात और कनज्यूमर्स का बहुत नाम लिया गया कि यह सरकारी कनज्यूमर्स पर बहुत असर गलेगा मैं एक दो उदाहरण देकर बतलाऊंगा कि क्या कभी कनज्यूमर्स का भी ब्याल किया जाता है? जब १९०६ में स्वदेशी का आन्दोलन चला और उसमें विदेशी वस्तुओं का बहिष्कार हो रहा था तो यह मिल वाले हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों की भावनाओं का फायदा उठाकर ३०० और ४०० पर सेंट नफा उठाने थे। जब गांधी जी के इनसिस्टेंस पर १९४८ में डिक्टोले किया गया तो, जैसा कि इस हाउस में कहा गया है, इन्हीं लोगों ने कपड़े का दाम बढ़ा कर २०० करोड़ रुपया अपनी जेबों में रखा। उस वक़्त इनको कनज्यूमर्स की कोई परबाह नहीं थी। आज उनको कनज्यूमर्स की बहुत परबाह हो गई है। इस देश की कोई भी इंडस्ट्री कपड़ा इंडस्ट्री या दूसरी कोई भी इंडस्ट्री, बिना प्रोटेक्शन के नहीं बढ़ी। जब काफी प्रोटेक्शन मिलता है और बाहर से आने वाली चीजों पर काफी कर लगाया जाता है तभी यहां की इंडस्ट्री बढ़ती है। आप शुगर इंडस्ट्री को ले लीजिये, कपड़े को ले लीजिये या और कोई इंडस्ट्री

को ले लीजिये। ये सब प्रोटेक्शन से ही बढ़ी हैं। पर उस वक़्त कनज्यूमर्स का ध्यान नहीं रहता है। लेकिन जब देश में इंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को बढ़ाने के लिये कुछ बात करते हैं या कुछ कांशवाही करते हैं तो कनज्यूमर्स की बात आ जाती है। मैं कहूंगा कि कनज्यूमर्स को यह ज्यादा पसन्द होगा कि यह इंडस्ट्री उनके गांवों में हो और काम करने वाले लोग जो कि शहरों में जाकर अपना स्वास्थ्य और चरित्र खराब करते हैं वह अपने घरों में रह कर काम करें और इस तरह से गांव भी हरे भरे हो जायेंगे। इस लिये मैं माननीय मिनिस्टर से अपील करूंगा कि कम से कम इस बिल को तो वह वापस ले लें और कोई दूसरा बिल लायें कि जिससे इंडलूम वालों को फायदा हो। इसको वापस लेने से लोगों को फायदा होगा।

एक माननीय सदस्य : इसको वापस लेने से कैसे फायदा होगा ?

पंडित डी० एन० तिवारी : यह आपने अच्छा याद दिलाया। अभी जो कानून है उसके अनुसार ४० पर सेंट की छूट मिली हुई है। इससे आप वह छूट ले रहे हैं। इसमें एक बलाज है कि लोग ज्यादा बनाव तो ज्यादा पैसा दे दिया करें। तो जब पैसा की ही बात है तो इंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को कैसे फायदा हो जायेगा? इस में जो बीती का डेफीनीशन दिया गया है उसमें कहा गया है कि उसकी किनारी रंगदार हो। लेकिन सब लोग जानते हैं कि बहुत सी ऐसी चीतियां होती हैं जो कि बिना किनारी की होती हैं या सफेद किनारी की होती हैं, जिनमें कोई रंग नहीं रहता है। अभी जो ४० पर सेंट बचा हुआ है और जिसकी छूट अभी दी जा रही है उसी ४० पर सेंट को मिल वाले सारी चीतियों के रूप में बनावने और वह कपड़ा देहानों में विक्रय

और इसमें कोई भी रुकावट नहीं हो सकती। इसके अलावा इसमें यह भी क्लोज है कि अगर वह ज्यादा धोतियां बनालें तो उनको गेडीशनल एक्साइज देना होगा। लेकिन अगर मिल वाले सफेद किनारी की धोती बनावेंगे तो वह उससे भी बच जायेंगे क्यों कि वह कपड़ा धोती की डेफोनोशन में नहीं आता है। आप देहातों में जाइयें वहां लोग मारकीन की धोती पहनते हैं क्योंकि वह मनचूत होती है। उसमें कोई किनारी नहीं रहती है। तो उस पर जो धोती की डेफोनोशन यहां पर की गई है वह लागू नहीं होती है। फिर मिल वाले जो हर बोके पर फायदा उठाना जानते हैं वह इससे भी फायदा उठावेंगे और ४० पर सेंट धोती बिना किनारी के बनावेंगे। इसलिये में कह रहा था कि इसमें हेन्डलूम इंडस्ट्री को कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। इससे तो लोगों पर कुछ अधिक कर लग जायेगा। और इसमें दाम ज्यादा बढ़ जायेगा। इस लिये में अपील करूंगा कि इस हाउस के सब सदस्यों के विरोध को देखते हुए माननीय मंत्री जो इस बिल को वापस ले लें और दूसरा कोई बिल लावें जिसमें कम से कम जो ४० पर सेंट छूट दिया गया है वह हेन्डलूम के लिये अनुगूण रहे और उनका बनाये हुए काम की अपेक्षा न हो।

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will call upon the hon. Minister because so many hon. Members are rising.

Dr. M. M. Das (Burdwan—Reserved—Sch. Castes): Sir, my State of West Bengal has figured prominently in the debates.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All hon. Members who want to speak will kindly rise in their seats.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Shri K. C. Sodhia (Sagar) rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think the hon. Member has already spoken.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Sir, I wish to speak on the third reading.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are 13 Members; how many minutes does each hon. Member want?

Some Hon. Members: Five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Thirteen into 5, that is sixty-five minutes; say, one hour. Now, it is three o'clock. Shall we carry on till 4?

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): Why not, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Hon. Members will remember that just now the hon. Speaker read about the Advisory Committee decision. I will close this at 4.15, giving 5 minutes to every hon. Member. I do not know if the hon. Minister wants to speak.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have said all that I could say, Sir.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): Will all the hon. Members who want to oppose the third reading get a chance?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All people who are supporting the Bill are also opposing the Bill and all those who oppose it are also supporting. Therefore, I am unable to make out who supports and who opposes the Bill. I give preference to the oldest gentleman, Babu Ramnarayan Singh.

• बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस यात्रा के लिए धाव को बहुत धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय: यात्रा नहीं, सलाह है।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह: धन्यवाद इस विषय के सम्बन्ध में मैंने बातें हुई और

[बाबू रामनारायण सिंह]

जितना आर्थिकवाद हुआ उसके लिए मैं इस सारी समा को धन्यवाद देता हूँ और बधाई देता हूँ। मैंने देखा कि प्रायः सभी लोगों ने दलबन्दी के दलदल से मुक्त हो कर अपने हृदय की बातें रखी हैं। लेकिन आश्चर्य तो उसवक्त होता है जब हम यह देखते हैं कि उसके बाद भी यह विधेयक पास होने जा रहा है और हाँ कर ही रहेगा। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक का अर्थ प्रायः सभी लोगों ने किया है और बहुत कुछ उन्होंने ठीक कहा है। उसको मैं और साफ़ क्रिये देता हूँ। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक का यह अर्थ है कि मिल-मालिक सरकार के हुकम को नहीं मानते हैं। इस का सीधा अर्थ यही है कि मिल मालिक सरकार को कुछ नहीं समझते हैं और सरकार का हुकम न मानते और इसका दूसरा अर्थ यह भी है कि मिल मालिकों को सजा देने के लिए सरकार के पास कोई शस्त्र नहीं है।

श्री सारंगधर बास : (बैनकनाल—पश्चिम कटक) : करना नहीं चाहते हैं।

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : यानी आप मजे में कह सकते हैं कि मिल मालिकों के साथ व्यवहार करने में इस सरकार ने अपने को बिल्कुल नपुंसक सिद्ध किया है। तो, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जरूरत यह थी कि यदि सरकार को लज्जा होती तो वह वहाँ से हट जाती और इन ट्रेजरी बेंचें पर मिल मालिकों को लाकर बिठा देती। अगर इस सरकार को अक्स, ईमानदारी और सज्जा होती तो वह वहाँ से हट जाती और मिलमालिक इस देश के मालिक हो जाते।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप सरकार बनायेंगे ?

बाबू रामनारायण सिंह : नहीं, वह अभी मेरा अस्तित्व नहीं है बहुतो मिल मालिकों का है। मैं मिल मालिक होता तो वहाँ जा कर बैठ सकता था।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विधेयक का एक दूसरा अर्थप्राय भी हो सकता है और वह क्या कि अगर कोई चोरी चोरी करे तो सरकार कहेगी कि चोरी कर सकते हो, लेकिन चोरी के माल में से एक हिस्सा सरकार को दे देना। मिल मालिकों को हुकम हुआ कि इतने तक तुम बना सकते हो, अधिक नहीं, लेकिन उन लोगों ने हुकम को नहीं माना, अधिक बना लिया। इस पर सरकार का कहना है कि कोई हजं नहीं, बनाओ, कानून तोशा तो तोड़ा, लेकिन कुछ हिस्सा दे दो। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि यहाँ की सरकार इस तरह से चल रही है। जितने लोग यहाँ बोलते गये वे सब ठीक बोलते गये। यह ठीक ही है कि जितने भी विषय संसार में हैं, वह यहाँ आवेंगे तो उन के दो पक्ष तो रहेंगे ही। अब प्रश्न यहाँ पर यह है कि खाद्य के सम्बन्ध में देश की क्या नीति हो सकती है और उसी के साथ साथ वस्त्र के सम्बन्ध में क्या नीति हो सकती है। इस वस्त्र के सम्बन्ध में महात्मा गान्धी ने बहुत कुछ कहा है। आप उसे जानते हैं, सारा देश जानता है, और जिन के हाथ में दुर्भाग्यवश अधिकार चला गया है वे लोग भी जानते हैं। महात्मा जी की नीति थी, और बड़ी वास्तविक नीति हो सकती है, कि कारखानों के लिए अगर वस्त्र बनना है तो उस से बहुत बहुत बुरावण होती है। सभी लोगों ने कहा कि बेकारी बढ़ती है। यह जितने तरह के कारखाने हमारे देश में खले हैं उन से साथ कुछ लोगों को जो कि पूजीपति हैं उन को तो लाभ हुआ है, लेकिन हमारे देश में जो बेकारी हुई है वह मिलों और कारखानों

के झुलने से हुई है। वस्त्र के सम्बन्ध में सरकार की नीति यही होनी चाहिये थी कि जिस के जरिए से देश को रोजगार मिले, कपड़ा बने। कोई खादी के लिये कहते हैं, कोई हाथ से कते सूत की खादी के लिये कहते हैं, जो हो, वह बने। लेकिन यह सारे देश में बने, सब जगह बने।

इसी सम्बन्ध में बोलते हुए हमारे ठाकुर दास जी ने बहुत सुन्दर कहा था। लेकिन एक बात उनकी ने कही जिस को मैं ठीक नहीं समझता। जब मैंने कहा था कि स्पिनिंग से भी लोगों को रोजगार मिलता है। उस का उन्होंने ने खंडन मंडन करते हुए कहा था कि ज्ञायद स्पिनिंग रैस्पूनरेटिव नहीं होता है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हर एक को जानना चाहिये कि जहां पर दो, तीन, चार रोजगार होते हैं वहां पर आप बहुत बर सकते हैं कि रैस्पूनरेटिव है या अनरैस्पूनरेटिव है, उस से लाभ होगा या नहीं होगा। (इस समय घंटी बजी) लेकिन जहां पर कोई रोजगार है ही नहीं, वहां यह सबाल पंदा नहीं होगा। मैं कहता हूँ कि जहां जहां खादी का काज हो रहा है जहां जा कर आप देखिये। आप को मालूम होगा कि लोग सुखी हैं, उन को रोजगार मिला है। खादी के सम्बन्ध में जो कताई का सबाल है, तो वह तो ऐसे लोग कातते हैं कि जिन को कोई रोजगार नहीं है, बहुत से लोग हैं जिन को कि कोई काम मिलता ही नहीं है। घर पर बैठे बैठे अपना वक्त बरबाद करते रहते हैं। उन को कुछ भी रोजगार मिले तो वह लाभ की ही बात है, उसमें रैस्पूनरेटिव और अनरैस्पूनरेटिव का सबाल नहीं है। साथ ही, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह भी कह दूँ कि जहां अच्छे सूत कातने वाले पांच छः घंटे अच्छी तरह काम करें तो बेड़ दो रुपया रोज बहुत कमा सकते हैं।

तो मैं यह अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता, आप ने घंटी बजा दी है। लेकिन वह जरूर कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार को कुछ अज्ञ होनी चाहिये, कुछ ईमानदारी से काम करना चाहिये, जिस से लोगों को कुछ रोजगार मिले। अभी तो पूंजीपतियों को जो पहले ही से मोटे हैं और मोटा किया जा रहा है। उस से देश की बरबादी है और सरकार अपने को भी इस से बरबाद कर रही है। जैसा और भाइयों ने कहा है। अच्छा तो यह हो कि मंत्री महोदय इस बिल को वापस ले लें। नहीं तो मैं कहता हूँ कि इस पर वोटिंग हो और जिसने लोग यहां हैं, सब दल के जितने सदस्य हैं, वे इस पर वोट करें और बिल को हटा दें। सरकार भले ही नपुंसक हां गयी, लेकिन यह लोक सभा नपुंसक नहीं है, इस बिल को नामंजूर कर के लोक सभा को वह साबित कर देना चाहिये।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):  
There is a proverb which says that a man should beware when everyone speaks well of him. I think a similar thing can be said about this Bill or something else when everyone speaks ill of it. I have listened to the debates on many occasions in the House but I have never before found such a unanimous disapproval of any bill as of this Bill. From every point of view, it is a very ill-conceived Bill. It is a Bill which is not going to do good to anybody. It is an ill wind that does not blow any good or does not do any good to anybody, and this Bill is not going to do any good to anybody. Will it tide over a crisis in any effective way? I think it has not taken into account the textile crisis that exists in this country and on which so much of our employment depends. Has it taken into account the sentiments and feelings of those people who are wedded to the cult of *swadeshi*? I don't think so. I think there are several persons who have

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

spoke against the Bill on the strength of its being almost anti-swadeshi in spirit. Has it taken into account the point of view of the consumer? I don't think so. I think the consumer is going to be hit hard by this Bill because of the additional burden that will be put upon him. The mill-owners are not going to suffer on account of this additional levy or fine and they will find some way to deal with the situation so that the burden will be put on the consumer. I think, Sir, that this Bill is not going to do anything useful to any section of consumers, public or business people. We would like to ask the hon. Minister what is going to be the policy of the Government in this matter. I think the ostensible object of the Bill is to help the handloom industry, but is this going to help that industry? I don't think so. There were certain amendments that were put before the House about the name of the Bill, about the definition of dhoti, about the definition of rates and about the way in which the money collected through this duty should be utilised, and I had always thought that the hon. Minister had an open mind, but while he was dealing with this Bill, I think he was giving the example of a closed mind. There were certain amendments which he could have accepted without the least harm and those amendments might have improved the Bill. For instance, the definition of dhoti that is given in the Bill is, to say the least, obsolete. I come from a State where dhoti, which has not a coloured border, is used very much by widows and persons who are not of the fashionable type. The hon. Minister has held this out of order and by this he has opened the flood gates for those people who will try to circumvent the provisions of the Bill. Again, I say, Sir, that I talk about the State which used to be No. 3 so far as the handloom weavers are concerned. Madras was No. 1, Assam No. 2 and my State was No. 3, and even in spite of the partition, my State is not badly off so far as this

kind of industry is concerned. I think this kind of Bill is not going to do any good to those weavers who are there, and I think it is going to harm them definitely, because I feel that all kinds of cloth under the counterfeit name of 'dhoti' will come on the market and they will take away that market which the handloom industry is now having.

One thing more I want to say. The Bill should have been presented in a more comprehensive form. After all the problem in India at this time is to limit the sphere for industrial production and the sphere for handloom production. I think this kind of tinkering with these matters will not do us any good. Something should be done on a comprehensive scale, as has been pointed out, that will limit this sphere. That will help us. I think the handloom industry has no right to thank the hon. Minister for whatever he has done. I think he must have done this in good faith, but I am sorry in the implementation of that good faith it has not been as effective as it should have been. I therefore think that this Bill should not be welcomed at all and I say that it should not be passed.

श्री जगड़े (बिलासपुर—रहित—  
अनुसूचित जातियाँ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय,  
मैंने इस बात का दुःख है कि माननीय मंत्री  
महोदय ने सब सदस्यों द्वारा इप विन का  
बिरोध किये जाने पर भी उनकी एक रती सर  
भी बात को नहीं माना और उन्होंने धोती  
में सफेद किनारे के सम्बन्ध में या दुरे सूत  
लवाने के सम्बन्ध में जो संशोधन आया  
या उसको भी स्वीकार नहीं किया । उस  
बिषयक में लोगों की राय थी कि पैनाल्टी  
क्लाज या दंड की धारा होनी चाहिये, इस  
बात को भी उन्होंने नहीं माना, क्योंकि साठ  
परसेंट कन्सेशन हम उनको दे रहे हैं, उसके  
उपरान्त हब परमिसिबल कोटा का साठे  
बारह परसेंट, पञ्चीस परसेंट या पचास



परसेंट तक हम उनको कंसेशन दे रहे हैं। क्या मैं यह समझूँ कि घाप जो एंतिरिक्त ऐक-साइज इयूटी लगा रहे हैं, वह केवल एंतिरिक्त कोटा के बाद उत्पादित किये जाने वाले कपड़ों पर लगाई जायेगी या साथ प्रतिघत के अन्दर जो पैदा किया जाने वाला कपड़ा है उस पर भी वह लादी जायेगी? इसका खुलासा मैं माननीय मंत्री जो से चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि मुझे शक है कि जो एंतिरिक्त कर साथ प्रतिघत के ऊपर लगाया जा रहा है, उसका बोझ साथ प्रतिघत के अन्दर पैदा किये जाने वाले कपड़े पर लादा जायेगा और नतीजा यह होगा कि हमारे किसानों और शरीर कंजूमर्स को जो उस कपड़े को पहनेंगे, उनको उसका भार सहना पड़ेगा और हम लोगों को गांवों में सबकी भत्सना सहनी पड़ेगी, क्योंकि हमें तो अपने निर्वाचन क्षेत्रों में जाना है और उनमें काम करना और रहना है, हाँ गवर्न-मेंट भले हो इस भत्सना को सुनने से बच जाय, उसको तो इलेक्शन के समय ही सब कुछ सुनना और सहना पड़ता है।

कपड़ों की कीमत और कंट्रोल के सम्बन्ध में मैं आपको बताऊँ कि जब कपड़े पर कंट्रोल था तो होता यह था कि कई कपड़े छूट पर दे दिये जाते थे, घाम तीर पर रही कपड़ों को छूट पर दिया जाता था।

पन्ध्या कपड़ा जो छूट के लिये दिया जाता था उसको भी कंट्रोल में शामिल किया जाता था। घाज कपड़े पर कंट्रोल नहीं है, तो घाठ घाने जो एंतिरिक्त कर लगता है, या दो घाने या छह घाने लगता है, साठे बारह परसेंट या पच्चीस परसेंट, दो घाने चार्ज करेंगे, चार घाने चार्ज करेंगे या छह घाने, कोई पेंसाइज नहीं है, क्योंकि कंट्रोल न होने के कारण वे लोग एक रुया, डेढ रुपया तक हमारे कंजूमर्स से हड़प सकते हैं। घाप कहते

हैं कि कई मित्रों में कार्य शक्ति बढ़ गई, या घट गई उसके अनुसार हमने डा कानून को बनाया है।

आज जो हैंडलूम वर्क्स की, करबे पर कपड़ा बुनने वालों को कार्य शक्ति घट गई, उनका व्यापार और रोजगार घोमा और मंदा हो गया, इसलिए उनकी धोमी चाल को बढ़ाने के लिये, उनको कार्य शक्ति का बढ़ाने के लिये या कपड़े के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने के लिये घाप कीम से कार्य कर रहे हैं, मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय में वह क्या प्रमाण और आश्वासन जनता को देना चाहते हैं? कपड़े की कमी के समय हर एक तरफ से आवाज घाती थी कि अधिक घोती पैदा कीजिये, लेकिन किसी मिल वाले ने अधिक घोटियां पैदा नहीं कीं, घोती के पहिनने वाले केवल हमारे देश के ही लोग हैं, मुश्किल से विदेश में घोती पहिनने वाले दो, तीन या चार लाख होंगे, उन दिनों में जब बहुत तंगी थी मित्र वालों ने पराजित मात्रा में घोटियां तैयार नहीं की, लेकिन आज क्या कारण है जो वह अधिक घोती तैयार करने पर मजबूर हो रहे हैं, उन दिनों में हमने उनसे अधिक घोती तैयार करने को कहा लेकिन उन्होंने तैयार नहीं कीं, फिर आज क्या कारण है जो वह अधिक घोती तैयार करने पर तुले हुये हैं? कारण यह दिखाई देता है कि मोवर प्रोडक्शन हो गया है और मुनाफा हो रहा है, कपड़ा मित्र के मालिकों को डर है कि कहीं वह फिर न घा जाय कि हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री तरक्की और प्रास्पर कर जाय और उन के दिन लद थं, इसलिए सरकार के पास मित्तत करते हैं कि यह कानून बदला जाय और दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि करोड़ों लोगों की आवाज हमारे मंत्री महोदय के पास नहीं पहुँचती और उन के कानों में जू तक नहीं रेंगती कि वह इस और

[ श्री जागड़े ]

ध्यान दें, लेकिन हमारे एक दो पूंजीपति भाई लोग मंत्री महोदय के पास पहुंच जाते हैं और मिलात करके अपनी बात मनवा लेते हैं, इस बात का मुझे बहुत दुःख है। बस, इस समय में केवल इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ।

**Shri Bhagwat Jha (Purnea cum Santal Parganas):** I appreciate the sentiments and the motives that have moved the hon. Minister to introduce this Bill in this House. I also acknowledge the forces—the lesser counterparts in the various States—that have forced his hand to introduce this Bill. I also know the result of our discussion, but yet, I want to register my own voice with many of the voices that have been expressed in this House while speaking on this Bill. It has been said at the outset by the hon. Minister that his only idea to bring this Bill in this House is to encourage and help the handloom weavers. May I ask, how, by passing this Bill, he proposes to give the handloom weavers beyond that 60 per cent.—40 per cent, is reserved for the handloom weavers—and by putting an additional excise duty for it? Does he mean that by putting this duty he will be able to check the millowners from producing more than 60 per cent.? Is it not within the millowners' right and power to sell cloth, which is produced over the 60 per cent. at a lesser price in the market and thereby undersell the handloom weavers? We are definitely of the opinion that by passing this Bill, the handloom weavers are in no way going to be helped. This is just another way of getting profit and other advantages for the millowners. Beyond 60 per cent. they will produce, whatever duty is put over that limit. They will produce it and they will float it in the open market. The common man and, I say, even the shopkeepers do know the theory of economics, the theory of demand and supply. The shopkeepers in my village will say: "Here is the cloth which

has been produced over the 60 per cent. limit. I have only this stock. You have it or you do not have it." The common man will have it and he will pay the cost—instead of Rs. 8 per pair, he will pay Rs. 12 per pair, and it is a simple thing. I suppose that all the friends, either here or there, have unanimously said that by passing this Bill we are not going to help the handloom weavers. So, while appreciating the sentiments and the motives of the hon. Minister, we feel constrained to say only that much, and not what I would have said of this Bill if it would have been framed otherwise. With these words Sir, I conclude.

**श्री बलबन्त सिंह महता (उदयपुर) :**

उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपका बहुत अनुगृहीत हूँ कि आपने मुझे अपने विचार रखने का इस समय अवसर दिया। मैं घरम्भ में ही कहूँ कि बिल जिस रूप में इस सदन में पास हो रहा है, इससे बिल्कुल भी बुनकरों को राहत मिलने वाली नहीं है। यही एक ऐसा बिल यहां पर पेश हुआ है जिसमें सामूहिक रूप से इसके प्रति विरोध प्रकट किया गया है, फिर भी यह पास किया जा रहा है। अगर जनता से इस के विषय में राय ली जाय तो मैं समझता हूँ कि एक भी बच्चा इसके पक्ष में नहीं होगा, लेकिन फिर भी यह घोषा जा रहा है उन लोगों के नाश पर कि इसके द्वारा बुनकरों की सहायता की जा रही है। मैं आपसे अपने प्रांत के विषय में प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि जहां तक राजस्वान का सवाल है, वह सारा का सारा प्रांत घाती वाला प्रदेश है और उसमें करीब ६९ फीसदी लोग घाती पहनते हैं, वहां की आबादी का ६० प्रतिशत लोग किसानों का काम करते हैं और वह बिना किनारी की घाती पहनते हैं। अब इस बिल के द्वारा क्या होगा, इस विषयक के पास हो जाने से जितने भी बुनकर हैं जो इस प्रकार की

घोती बगैरह बनाया करते हैं, उन सब का बंधा नष्ट हो जायगा। आज बुनकरों की हालत पहले से बहुत ही खराब है, और राजस्थान में बुनकर सबसे ज्यादा संख्या में रहते हैं, उनकी हालत पहले से ही खराब है और उस पर इस विधेयक के पास हो जाने से राजस्थान को एक बहुत बड़ा धक्का लगने वाला है। राजस्थान को करोड़ों करोड़ की जनता में बुनकरों की बहुत बड़ी संख्या है और मैं समझता हूँ कि आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि मंत्री यहोदय एक ऐसा बिल लायें जिस से वास्तव में बुनकरों की सहायता की जा सके और जिसके द्वारा हेन्डलूम इंडस्ट्री और खादी उद्योग को प्रोत्साहन मिले। जब तक ऐसा बिल नहीं आयेगा तब तक हम न तो उन लोगों को राहत पहुंचा सकेंगे और न जो बेकारी बहुत बिकराल रूप में फैली हुई है उसको ही दूर कर सकेंगे। मेरा विचार है कि अगर वे इस बिल को पास कराने पर उतारू ही हैं तो वे जल्दी से जल्दी एक बिल लायें जिसके द्वारा हम वास्तव में बुनकरों की सहायता कर सकें। सब से भ्रष्टा तो यह ही कि पहले ऐसे प्रतिबंध मिल जायें पर लगा दिये जायें कि वह सर्टेन काउन्टस तक, एक खास तरह के प्राक के मूत के ऊपर कपड़ा न बना सकें। जब तक ऐसा नहीं किया जाता तब तक वास्तव में न हम उद्योग बंधों को फायदा पहुंचा सकेंगे और न लाखों धादमियों को राहत पहुंचा सकेंगे जिनको हम राहत पहुंचाना चाहते हैं।

इसके अलावा मैं आप के द्वारा अपने कामर्स मिनिस्टर से यह भी दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि अब तक हमारा जो काटेज इन्डस्ट्री, उद्योग बंधों का सामान है उसकी बिस्तृत अपत नहीं हो रही है और वह डेटों पड़ा हुआ है, इस लिये स्पेशल और केंद्रीय मवर्नमेंट उस सामान को उठावें और उसको पल कर के, हेन्डलूम के बने हुए सामान

को और खादी के सामान को फिर्मां के कपड़े के साथ पूल करके हमारे जिनमें भी सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, हमारे मिनिस्टर्स हैं, पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर्स हैं, लेजिस्लेचर्स के मेम्बर्स हैं, उन सब को वह कपड़ा राशन के रूप में थोड़ा थोड़ा बँचे। इस में मैं समझता हूँ कि वास्तव में उन लोगों को लाभ होगा।

इतना ही कह कर मैं अपने भाषण को समाप्त करता हूँ।

**Dr. M. M. Das:** During the discussion, rather long and heated discussion, during first reading of the Bill, my State West Bengal has been featured very prominently by frequent references to it. Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, an eminent, senior and esteemed Member of this House and some other speakers referred to the speech delivered by one of the Members from West Bengal and expressed their surprise that a spokesman from West Bengal, Bengal which led the Swadeshi movement and preached the boycott of foreign goods, should speak against a measure calculated to benefit the cottage industries of the country.

Sir, it is true that the Bengal of the past, the Bengal which my hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava knew, does no longer exist. It has been effaced from the map of India. A small truncated province, reduced to one third of its former size, inhabited by thirty lakhs of unfortunate refugees, West Bengal is but a relic of its own glorious past. Sir, frustration, poverty, unemployment and hunger are sweeping today through the length and breadth of that unfortunate truncated State.

**Shri B. K. Das (Contai):** Not so bad!

**Dr. M. M. Das:** My hon. friend from Bengal says: 'Not so bad', but I hold a different opinion from him.

I wish to tell my hon. friend Pandit Bhargava and others that Bengal may

[Dr. M. M. Das]

have lost in stature, but Bengal has not lost in patriotism; Bengal has not lost her love for the motherland. Bengal has not lost her spirit of self-sacrifice for a noble cause.

Sir, I appeal to my hon. friend Pandit Bhargava and others to understand, to appreciate the difficulties, the knotty problems that the West Bengal Government have to face due to the promulgation of this restriction order.

Several hon. Members of the House referred to the so-called misbehaviour of the textile mills of West Bengal and asked why adequate action was not taken, why condign and deterrent punishment was not meted out to these textile mills in West Bengal. Some of my hon. friends here also pointed out the tacit support which the West Bengal Government gave to the mills. I wish my hon. friends to understand the implications, the results, the effects, of the restriction order upon the cloth market in Calcutta and other places in West Bengal. Sir, as soon as the restriction order was promulgated, dhotis became scarce in the Calcutta market and the price shot up by 30 to 40 per cent. The people of West Bengal, unfortunately, are a politically conscious people. They saw that by an act of indiscretion and want of foresight on the part of the Central Government this artificial scarcity in the cloth market had been created. Sir, the common people of West Bengal driven to desperation by poverty, unemployment and hunger were not prepared to take this situation lying down calmly. The Government of West Bengal, grown wiser by the bitter experience of the past, felt the pulse of the people and they knew that a storm was coming. They approached the Central Government, they pleaded with them, they implored them to help them, so that this crisis may be staved off.

Sir, that was not all. The West Bengal Government had to go so far

as to impose a temporary ban upon the export of all mill-made cloth from that State. I want my hon. friends to understand, to appreciate, the situation which the West Bengal Government had to face at that time. Sir, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not express my thanks, my appreciation and gratitude to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry at the Centre for the consideration, for the sympathy, for the understanding which they showed towards the Government of West Bengal in those difficult days.

Sir, we are told by many hon. Members in this House and by the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry that the first suggestion to restrict the production of the mills came from Rajaji, our great Chief Minister of the State of Madras; because he wanted to do something which would benefit the handloom weavers of Madras. There was a difference of opinion, Sir, among the administrators of this country about this proposal, but the dissentient voices were silenced, the opposition was ruled out and the suggestion was given effect to. As a Member, coming from West Bengal I must submit to this House and to the Government that a policy which may solve to a small extent the problem of one State, but would at the same time create difficulties and knotty problems for the others, should not be given effect to by Government.

श्री अर० डी० मिश्र (जिला बुलन्दशहर):

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल की देल कर मुझे बड़ा अफसोस हो रहा है कि बाज हमारे सामने इस किस्म का बिल हमारी कांग्रेस मिनिसट्री ला रही है। मैं ३३ साल से कांग्रेस में काम कर रहा हूँ और कांग्रेस में रह कर हमारा सब से बड़ा ध्येय यह रहा है कि हम इस देश के गरीबों को रोचना दें। जुलाहे, कोरी घाबि जो यहां पर कपड़े बुनते थे और जिन की दस्तकारी नष्ट हो गई थी, उनकी दस्तकारी को जिंदा करें।

बराबर ३३ सालों से हम कोशिश करते रहे और हमको भाशा थी कि जिस दिन स्वराज्य हो जायेगा और गवर्नमेंट हमारे हाथ में आयेगी उसको लेकर हम इस कार्य को तरक्की दे सकेंगे। लेकिन आज मैं क्या देखता हूँ कि जो फरायज एक गवर्नमेंट को करने चाहियें वह यह गवर्नमेंट नहीं कर रही है। प्रजातंत्र के अन्दर प्रजा के नुमायन्दे जो अपने वजीर चुनते हैं उनका काम यह होता है कि यह किसी नीति का निश्चय करे और उसके बाद वह यह देखें कि जो निश्चय उन्होंने किया है उसका पालन एग्जिक्यूटिव आफिसर्स करते हैं या नहीं। एग्जिक्यूटिव आफिसर्स का यह काम होता है कि जो निश्चय मिनिस्टर लोग करे, जो कानून बनायें उस कानून को वह नकनीयती के साथ पूरा करें और जो लोग उस कानून के खिलाफ जायें उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही करे। अगर वह अफसर लोग अपने कर्तव्य में कोताही करते हैं तो मिनिस्ट्री का काम है कि वह यह देखे कि ऐसे अफसरों को महकमों से निकाल कर बाहर खड़ा कर दिया जाय और उनसे कहा जाय कि तुमने अपने काम को पूरा क्यों नहीं किया। हम यह देखते हैं कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने यह तैयारी की है कि यहाँ पर ६० परसेंट घोतियाँ मिलों से तैयार की जाय और ४० परसेंट बुनकरों के लिये छोड़ दी जायेंगी। हमारे जो एग्जिक्यूटिव अफसरान हैं उन्होंने अपनी ड्यूटी पूरी नहीं की और उन्होंने यह नहीं देखा कि मिलें ६० परसेंट से एक घोती भी ज्यादा न बनाने पायें और हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी यह नहीं देखा कि इन अफसरान ने अपनी ड्यूटी पूरी की या नहीं। उन अफसरान के खिलाफ कार्यवाही करने के बजाय हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब उल्टे इस लिये एक बिल लाते हैं कि हमारे अफसरान ने हमारे हुकम की तामीत नहीं की और पूंजीपतियों ने भी हमारे हुकम तामीत

नहीं की इसलिये यह कानून पास किया जाय। आज जो हम लोग खर्च पहनते हैं तो इसी लिये पहनते हैं कि हम यह दिखलाना चाहते हैं कि हम देशी रोजगार को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे अफसर लोग खर्च के सिद्धांत को समझें। मैं जब से पालियामेंट में आया हूँ तब से देख रहा हूँ कि मिनिस्टर साहिबान और बहुत से मेम्बर साहिबान खर्च पहनते हैं लेकिन हमारे अफसरान खर्च नहीं पहनते हैं। उन पर हमारे खर्च धारण करने का कोई धरन नहीं हुआ। जब अंग्रेजी जमाने में हम उनसे कहते थे कि आप खर्च पहनें तो वह कहते थे कि क्या करें नौकरी का मामला है, हम खर्च कैसे पहन सकते हैं। अगर हम खर्च पहनें तो हम को निकाल दिया जायेगा। लेकिन अब हम समझते थे कि यह भी खर्च पहनें। लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि इस पर दो मत हैं। कांग्रेस के लोग तो चाहते हैं कि देशी रोजगार चले और गरीबों को रोजगार मिले लेकिन जो हमारे अफसर लोग हैं जो कि पश्चिमी शिक्षा पाये हुए हैं वह इस को पसन्द नहीं करते हैं। यह पूंजीपतियों के साथ है। मिनिस्टर साहब ने कानून बनाया कि ६० परसेंट से ज्यादा घोती मिल वाले न बनायें लेकिन हमारे अफसरान ने मिल वालों को तरजीह दी, उनको बढ़ावा दिया कि वह जितना चाहें बनायें, कोई बात नहीं है, देखा जायेगा, जब बात आयेगी तो मिनिस्टर साहब से कह दें कि कानून बदल दिया जाय। इस लिये मिलों ने काफी घोतियाँ बना डालीं। अब यह कानून लाया जा रहा है कि भूकिस मिल वालों ने ज्यादा माल बना लिया है इसलिये उनसे कुछ पैसा ले लिया जाय। अगर पैसा का ही रूपाल होता तो हम खर्च क्यों पहनते। क्या हम सस्ती घोती नहीं पहन सकते थे। मैं देखता हूँ कि जो गरीब लोग हैंडलूम से गुजर करते थे उन जुलाहों के पास काम नहीं है। वह भूले मर रहे हैं,

[ श्री भार० बी० मिश्र ]

कोई ग्राम बेच रहा है कोई गाजर बेच रहा है। उनके पास रोजगार नहीं है। पहले उनको सूत नहीं मिलता था जब सूत की सुविधा हुई तो मिल मालिकों ने उनका भ्रन्धापुन्ध मुकाबला शुरू कर दिया। मिल मालिकों ने जब यह देखा कि यह लोग धोती बनाने लगे हैं तो उनको डर हुआ। उन लोगों ने आपके भ्रफसरो को अपनी तरफ मिला लिया और ज्यादा माल बना लिया। और इसलिये हेंडलूम का काम नहीं चल सका। जब हमारे जमाने में ही यह काम नहीं चल सकता तो फिर कौनसा जमाना आबेगा जब कि यह हेंडलूम का काम चल सकेगा। इस बिल से तो हम देख रहे हैं कि मिनिस्टर साहब अपने काम में फेल हुए हैं। और उनका एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन निकम्मा रहा है। कानून को नहीं माना गया। यह देखना गवर्नमेंट का काम है कि उसके हुकम को माना जाये। आखिर गवर्नमेंट है किस वास्ते अगर वह अपना हुकम न मनवा सके? क्या आज गवर्नमेंट अपने हुकम को नहीं मनवा सकती है?

श्री रामनारायण शिंदे (हजारीबाग पश्चिम) ऐसी सरकार को निकाल दीजिये।

श्री भार० बी० मिश्र : मैं प्रजं करूंगा कि मेहरबानी करके इस निकम्मे बिल को वापस लीजिये और यह कोषिष कीजिये कि आपके हुकम की पूरी पाबन्दी हो और जो पूंजीपति एक भी धोती ज्यादा बनावे उसको सजा दीजिये और उस पर जुर्माना कीजिये। उनकी धोतियों को जो ज्यादा बन गई है उखल कर लीजिये और उनकी बेच दीजिये। अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो आपकी बात मानी जा सकती है। हम कांग्रेस वाले यहां क्यों आये हैं? क्या हम गवर्नमेंट में रहने के

लिये आये हैं? हम देखते हैं कि यहां दिल्ली में गांधी टोपी को फूँका जाता है। ऐसा किस तरह से होता है? यह गवर्नमेंट के भ्रफसरो की वजह से होता है। पूंजीपतियों ने उनको अपनी तरफ कर लिया है। यह पूंजीपति नहीं चाहते कि खदर बने और हेंडलूम का कपड़ा बने। यह लोग भ्रफसरो को साथ लेकर गांधी टोपी की मिट्टी पनीव करताते हैं। दिल्ली शहर में यह हमारे ही सामने होता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हक्काय यह महसूस करें कि गांधी टोपी इस तरह न फूँकी जाय। यह इसलिये होता है कि भ्रफसरान खुद खदर नहीं पहनते हैं। उनका खदर और हेंडलूम में विश्वास नहीं है। इसलिये मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आप इस बिल को वापस लें। हसी के साथ मैं आपसे यह प्रजं करूंगा कि आपके भ्रफसर भी यह महसूस करें कि खदर और हेंडलूम से गरीबों को रोजगार मिलता है। वह कालर टाई छोड़ कर खदर और हेंडलूम का कपड़ा पहनें। जब वह ऐसा करेंगे तब उनको हेंडलूम में यकीन हो जायेगा और वह चाहेंगे कि खदर और हेंडलूम की तरक्की हो और तभी हम अपने हुकम को पूंजीपतियों से मनवा सकते हैं। जिस दिन भ्रफसर लोग अपनी पोशाक को बदल लेंगे उसी दिन हम हेंडलूम और देशी रोजगार को तरक्की दे सकेंगे और आप देखेंगे कि दिन दूनी रात बीगुनी तरक्की होगी।

एक मिनट।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No more minute. Shri Samanta. I will first of all exhaust hon. Members who have not spoken on this Bill.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): I apprehend that Government will have to bring another measure to meet

the defect that has crept into this Bill. I am referring to item (ii) of sub-clause (a) of clause 2 which reads "contains coloured yarn on its borders" while defining dhoti. By this the textile mills will go on producing dhoties—they will not call it dhoti—with white borders. They will go on producing thans which will be cut into pieces and the borders will be dyed or stamped outside.

Our Government is anxious to give relief to handlooms and handloom labourers by cutting the quota of dhoties in mills. But if in this way the mills go on producing dhoties with white border—they will not call them dhoties, they will call them thans—then what will the poor handloom labourers get?

Now, in spite of the cut of the quota of dhoties, the only difficulty that handlooms are facing is the want of yarn. They are not getting sufficient yarn. The hon. Minister in his reply to the debate said that in different States of India the handlooms weave different things. In one part they produce dhoties and sarees; in another part a very small quantity of dhoties or sarees is produced. So instead of putting this restriction on dhoties or sarees, if the Government had tried to supply the handlooms with sufficient quantity of yarn they would have been benefited. My suggestion is, let the Government come forward to nationalise this textile industry. If they are not able to do that, let them turn these textile mills into spinning mills and allow these handlooms to be provided with a sufficient quantity of yarn so that they may produce dhoties, sarees and other things, so that these handloom labourers—wretched labourers—may be saved from the catastrophe they have fallen in. This Government is trying to put restrictions on these textile mills with different measures. But, these clever people are finding out loopholes and are not allowing the Government to help those whom the Government are very anxious to help. My request is that the Govern-

ment should see whether these textile mills could be turned into only spinning mills.

**Shri Gidwani (Thana):** Sir, I do not want to repeat the arguments which have been advanced in this House. Every section of the House has opposed this Bill. Except the Commerce Minister, there is not a single speaker either from these Benches or those Benches that has spoken in favour of the Bill. Therefore, I feel that it would be an insult to democracy and a murder of democracy if the Commerce Minister proceeds with the Bill and it is not withdrawn.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** He has got it.

**Babu Ramnarayan Singh:** There is no democracy.

**Shri Gidwani:** My Congress friends have been saying that they will not be able to face their constituencies after this Bill is passed. May I ask them, if every one of them feels that it is harmful to the cause of the handloom weavers or the handloom industry, why don't they tell the Government that they should withdraw this Bill. They may go to the Party or their executive. After making vehement speeches against the Bill, when the bell rings and the motion is put to vote, if they go and vote for it, they will be murdering their conscience.

**Babu Ramnarayan Singh:** They would not do it this time.

**Shri Gidwani:** I say, in the name of democracy, in the name of service to the people, in the name of Gandhi, in the name of the Congress, the Government must withdraw this Bill. One hon. Member was finding fault with the officers that they were not following their masters. The new masters are not their masters: I am not entering into that matter now. The real fact is that the hon. Minister has a capitalist 'Atma' in a body of vanaspati Congressman. It is high time to realise the whole situation in its proper perspective and make an effective change in the personnel of the Government.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, knowing full well, coming at the fag end of the debate, that the caravan will go on in a few minutes, I still oppose this Bill, and very strongly also.

In doing this, I wish to refer to a country about which I read this morning. Our Textile Commissioner had been to Japan and he has come back. He has delivered a lecture somewhere in Bombay about the way in which the textile industry there co-operates with all sorts of cottage industries. There the small industries and the large industries are so well co-ordinated that they go on together, and both of them show true patriotism. Then, again, later in the forenoon, I heard our hon. Member Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan about her experiences when she said the same thing. I am myself reminded of what I had seen 40 years ago in Japan. There, because of the intense patriotism in that country, the capitalist mill owners, big fellows, do not try to swallow up the little fellows. They co-operate with them so that Japan becomes big and prosperous. As you know, Sir, before the First World War Japan had captured the cheap market all over Asia and in parts of Africa also, because of that co-operation between the big fellow and the small fellow. Also, the steamship companies that carried the goods to the foreign markets so co-operated with the producers that there was a specially low rate of freight for the Japanese goods going to foreign markets. Unfortunately, in our country, that universal patriotism does not exist. I have also known another big capitalist country that my hon. friends say is an imperialist country, and compared with them, our Indian capitalists are absolutely self-centred and they want to aggrandise everything for themselves. We see particularly in the textile industry, during the last 5 or 6 years, sometimes, there is scarcity of cloth, but there is yarn enough for the handloom industry and handloom cloths come to the market. Then, the mills produce cloth and the stocks of handloom cloth

accumulate. Then again, something happens and the mill cloth goes out to foreign markets and then, there is scarcity. Sometimes, they do not supply enough yarn to the handloom weavers. During the present Commerce Minister's predecessor's time, there were processions here and there and he was mobbed in Nagpur or some place in Madhya Pradesh because they held him responsible for not getting sufficient yarn. If there is yarn and if they produce cloth, there is more production here. A restriction order was passed. I do not agree with many of my friends who have spoken against this Bill that the officers concerned are to blame. I blame the Government itself. As far as I can see,—in the sugar industry we had seen some years ago and also in this textile industry the Government is run by these mill owners, whether it is in sugar or in textiles, whether they are in Bengal or U.P. or Madras. Capitalism does not know any provincial barriers; they are of the same breed all over, and that breed is ruling this country through this Government. I therefore make this constructive suggestion that, instead of patching up here and there, handling a situation today and then again another situation next year, the Government must nationalise the textile mill industry. When I say this, many of my friends will say, where is the money to pay the compensation. (*Some Hon. Members:* No compensation.) You know, Sir, and every one else knows that many of the mills in Bombay and Ahmedabad are 30 or 40 or 50 years old and they have paid their capital hundreds of times over. Those mills that are new have some value. The compensation must be calculated on the basis of the condition that mills are in. If that is done, the compensation will not be very much. But whatever it is, whether you pay full compensation or a small compensation, for the public good, acquire these mills and then, so regulate that that patriotism of Japan will be manifest in the Government here. And then only the mill industry can be regulated and the handloom and spinning



industry and Khadi industry will produce such lines that they are most capable of doing. The mill industry will produce goods that can be exported and that can cater to the needs of a particular class of people who wear fine and superfine cloth and so on. In this way only this eternal conflict of the last number of years between the mill industry and the handloom industry will disappear. Otherwise, this patching up will not do, and I will have the chance to say again that this Government is run by these mill-owners, whether it is sugar, textile or rubber or any other industry, that the Government is always looking to the interests of the big people and not the small people. I say this again because in this case, where they have gone beyond a certain limit in producing cloth, why is it that those who transgress the law are not punished? There are many laws that a poor man infringes. Do you let him go scot-free and give him a reward in another way? You don't. It is only the vested interests that you protect.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There does not seem to have been a law empowering Government to impose any punishment.

**Shri Sarangadhar Das:** Well, the law should have been there. They don't do it.

In the sugar debate I remember we were told there was an agreement between the Government and the sugar mill-owners that they cannot sell beyond Rs. 28-8-0 per maund, but later on it became known that there was no written agreement. It was a gentlemen's agreement and the Sugar Syndicate said that Rs. 28-8-0 was the minimum price and they could not prevent any mill from raising the price beyond that, and that the maximum was not Rs. 28-8-0. So, in that way, loopholes are kept by this Government so that the producers, the big producers, the mill-owners, can have the advantage, and any time, some loophole which is discovered, then again something else is wrong

which will result in another loophole being discovered next year.

This is all I have to say, and mine is the only constructive way in which you can enforce patriotism on the mill-owners as well as the people, and this is the only way in which the mill-industry and the handloom industry and the Khadi industry can prosper in this country. Otherwise there is no hope.

**Shri Kelappan (Ponnani):** I do not agree with my friend Shri Gidwani. I am not troubled on the score of democracy. Democracy consists in saying what you please and in voting as you are told. If there is going to be a division on this Bill, you will see how people vote.

I agree with the Minister of Commerce and Industry that this is a very simple measure. It only proposes to levy a graded duty on dhoties produced in the mills in excess of the 60 per cent. they are allowed. From that point of view it is simple. But if, as the Statement of Objects and Reasons says, it is in pursuance of the decision to help the handloom industry, then it is a very disappointing one. This Bill waters down the promise that has been given to the handloom industry. The problem that faces us is not simply how to find a market for the handloom products—that is easily solved,—but how to resuscitate and revitalise the handloom industry which is already dying. It is not simply a decent burial that it deserves as the hon. Minister thinks. Our problem is how to expand this cottage industry and solve the problem of unemployment.

It is said that there are 29 lakhs of handlooms in this country. Here is a cottage industry which is capable of considerable expansion and can provide work for a hundred lakh of weavers or more. The handloom industry properly organised can give work and food for 5 crores of people. Viewed in that light, this measure is a reactionary measure which amounts

[Sbri Kelappan]

to a betrayal of the handloom industry. I know the Industries Minister is a friend of the mill industry and the business concerns. He does not believe in cottage industry. He may not be committed to the revival of the cottage industry, but the Congress is. I do not wish to say anything more on that.

It was as a result of widespread agitation in the country that the manufacture of dhoties by mills was restricted. The demand from the State of Madras was for the reservation of dhoties and sarees to the handlooms. The Minister did not see his way to do that. That was the only way really to revive the handloom industry. If this Bill is not intended as a going-back on the original decision to restrict the mills to 60 per cent. of the production of dhoties, I cannot understand why there should be a graded duty. The duty must be a computative one. It is immaterial whether they produce 5 per cent. or 50 per cent. more. I shall make it a rupee per yard.

I concede it is somewhat indecent for well-fed people to discuss the hunger of the less favoured, but I want to remind the Minister that hunger was responsible for all the revolutions in the world. It was hunger that precipitated the French Revolution. A mob of hungry women marched to the Parliament House. The politicians made good their escape. They, joined by their men, marched on the Bastille and the fall of Bastille was the inauguration of a new era in Europe. The revolutionary movement in the "hungry forties" of the 19th century in Europe also had its origin in hunger. The revolt of the East against Western domination was really due to hunger. And this Government also may take a warning from this. Unemployment is going to be the rock on which this Government will crash.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** Will they make good their escape?

**Shri Pocker Saheb (Malappuram):** In the first place, I would just remind the House that I have got the greatest respect for my colleagues in the House, but it is high time that a convention is established here that the voting should correspond with the speeches made. If the speeches made here are taken into account, I do not think this Bill can survive the debate.

4 P.M.

Coming to the Bill itself, I should submit that it is the most ill-conceived Bill. It is difficult to understand what is really intended by this Bill. Is it intended to help the handloom industry? Certainly, it does not help the handloom industry. Is it intended to help the consumers? No, it does not help the consumers. If at all it helps anybody, it helps the millowners themselves, though it purports to impose some kind of a levy on them.

This question of the mill *versus* the handloom industry is a chronic one, and it has come to a crisis now. If you see the thousands of persons roaming about the country, particularly in the south, it is really a heartrending sight, and our Government here do not seem to tackle the problem seriously. They are playing with the problem, and with such a Bill as this they seek to tackle it. As has been characterised by an hon. Member on the other side, this is nothing but an eyewash.

If it is said that this Bill purports to help the handloom industry, I ask, how does it help the handloom industry? When it is mentioned by some hon. Members on this side of the House—of course, it might be from a Communist Member—that so many hundreds of persons are dying of starvation, on account of having been thrown out of employment in the handloom industry, the hon. Minister meets it by saying that whatever comes from the communalists...

**Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada):** Communists.

**Shri Pocker Saheb:** I am sorry, I meant the Communists. The hon. Minister meets it by saying that whatever comes from the Communists is not true, for he has no faith in their *bona fides*. I certainly do not see eye to eye with the Communists, and I too am one of those who think that they are wanting in *bona fides* in many matters, but when a Communist speaks the truth, it does not cease to be truth, simply because it comes from a Communist. I do say that many people who have been thrown out of employment in the handloom industry are dying of starvation. What have the Government done to save the lives of the many hundreds of people who are roaming about in Malabar, in Calicut and other places, where gruel centres had to be started for months, in order to save their lives?

The hon. Minister was saying that no constructive suggestion has been made. When a constructive suggestion was made by no less a person than that veteran administrator, the Chief Minister of Madras, to exclude the production of *dhotis* and *saris* from the mills, and reserve them for the handloom industry completely, what action did the Central Government take? They cared a twopence for that suggestion, and now it is being said that no constructive suggestion has been made. Why did they not accept that suggestion, particularly when it came from the most responsible person, from a veteran administrator, who was in charge of the Commerce and Industry portfolio, in the Centre, some time back, and whom the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry calls his erstwhile leader? If the Government were serious, they ought to have brought a Bill reserving the *dhotis* and *saris* completely for the handloom industry, and excluding their production from the mills. The attitude of Government shows that the mill is their pet child, and what treatment they are giving to the handloom industry is only one of a step-motherly character, and it is nothing but an eyewash.

Therefore, I oppose this Bill.

**Shri Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes):** The intention of this Bill is to impose a levy on the production of *dhotis* over and above the permissible quota fixed by an Act of Parliament in January last. Now, the hon. Minister wants to prevent the mills from producing over and above the limit fixed, and also to levy some duty on the extra production. But this is not going to help the handloom weavers in any way, as the hon. Minister has stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. If he has any desire to improve the lot of the handloom weavers, he must have brought in a Bill, reserving the production of *dhotis* and coloured and bordered *saris*, for the handloom industry.

The Chief Minister of Madras State, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari has been demanding from the Central Government for the past one and a half years, the complete reservation of the production of *dhotis* and coloured and bordered *saris*, but the Central Government have been very indifferent to that just demand. There is a feeling in the south, that the Central Government have not been sympathetic towards the people of the south, who are suffering. You know that there are lakhs of people, both in the Madras and Andhra States, who are engaged in the handloom industry. In Tamil Nad alone, there are 38 lakhs of people, who are entirely dependent, in one way or the other, on the handloom industry. But since the last four years, they have been thrown out of employment, because of the unhealthy attitude of the Central Government. Thousands of families of the handloom weavers have been broken, and thousands of people have become regular beggars, and they are roaming about from one corner of the State to another, begging from door to door, even for a handful of food. The hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry, who hails from the south, knows very well the plight of the handloom weavers, and surely he must have taken some radical steps to redress

[Shri Veeraswamy] -

the grievances of the handloom weavers. Instead of doing that, he has been strengthening the hands of the mill-owners, not only by this Bill, but also by the other Bill that has already been passed.

If the hon. Minister sincerely and honestly wants to redress the grievances of the handloom weavers throughout the country, he must tear this Bill into pieces, and come forward with a fresh Bill, reserving completely the production of *dhotis* and *saris* to the handloom industry, and preventing the mills from producing any kind of *dhotis* and *saris*, coloured or bordered. Let the mills produce fine or superfine cloth for the rich people who are in a position, to purchase any kind of thing that they need, by paying a very exorbitant price. But the poor people need things at a cheaper price. I am sure, if the handloom weavers are given employment, they will produce cloth which will satisfy the needs of the poor people. I dare say once again, that if the handloom weavers in the south are given employment, they would produce quantity of cloth we require. We have already begun to boycott mill-made cloth in the south, and two years ago, we, of the Dravidian Federation, picketed the mill-made cloth shops. That is a very well-known thing, to the hon. Members who are coming from the south.

So if the Central Government are going on like this and if they are indifferent to the sufferings of the south, I warn them that sometime or other the fight that has been going on for the past 15 years for complete secession of the south from the north will get a momentum and that will decide this issue.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Dr. Rama Rao. After he finishes, I will call the hon. Minister.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the discussion in the House has made one thing very clear, that the hon. Members are alive or conscious

to the condition of unemployment and starvation and the critical situation amongst the handloom weavers. I do not think the hon. Minister is equally conscious of the acuteness of the situation. He knows the position. But the situation worsening from day to day is really pathetic. Because all the sections of the House, irrespective of parties, attack the policy of the Government, the hon. Minister lets off his steam against the unfortunate Communist Party. I do not know what we on this side of the House said which was not said on the other side yesterday.

One thing I want to make clear. Probably the Minister does not know that a certain person in Bhimavaram (in West Godavari district) committed suicide. He had left a letter behind—he did not send the letter to Mr. Gopala Rao. But after his death, the letter was found. It was addressed to Mr. C. Rajagopalachari. I do not know whether it was sent to him afterwards or not. He wrote that letter after days of starvation saying that he was dying because the Government was not helping the handloom industry.

Secondly, of course, I do not mind all the compliments he paid us. They come from everywhere—from Syngman Ree to MacArthy and the British Government.

**An Hon. Member:** A symposium.

**Dr. Esma Rao:** Leaving that alone, I am astounded at his statement that the handloom weavers do not want to work. Probably he does not mean it. He said that they were previously making money out of the quota permits. It is partly true. But to say that they do not want to work is most astounding and adding insult to injury. People are ready to work and we all know—you know particularly—they work for 10, 12 or 14 hours a day without a living wage. Facing starvation they are prepared to work; and what they want is work and a living wage. Of course, they can have

plenty of yarn, but without a living wage they have to work.

Before I conclude, I would just quote a prominent Congressman, Pandit Sunderlal. He referred to the Banarsi industry.

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** Is he a Congressman?

**Dr. Rama Rao:** A Congressman. I would just read it:

"Industries which successfully stood the shock of foreign rule for over a century are now in danger of becoming extinct".

And he talks about starvation and all that. I do not, therefore, need to convince the Members—and it is impossible to convince the Minister—that there is starvation among handloom workers. Therefore, I suggest, Sir, that this is a serious problem. It is not a problem for a month or two or a year or two. He has to face this for a number of years. There are conflicting interests—the millowners, mill workers, consumers and the handloom weavers. Therefore, we must have some compromise. Some people must have to pay more so that nearly a crore of people won't starve and won't die. I saw recently some families. I saw starvation in their face. It is pathetic. Some of them come to me for medical consultation, and in the usual routine, like a medical man, I say 'Take good food—eggs, milk, fruit'. But where are eggs and milk? They do not have even 'kanjee', Sir. So the position is very serious.

The first thing Government must do is to come to a sort of compromise between the various interests. *Dhoties* and bordered and coloured *sarees* must be reserved for the handloom. And I want the Minister to think in terms of supplying yarn at cheap rates to the handloom weaver. Any amount of money you supply is of no use. Even if you give 10 crores of rupees to the handlooms, it won't do any good.

I am finishing, Sir. They must look after the supply of yarn. The wily

capitalists may not supply them with yarn at cheap rates. Therefore, the Government must think and devise some means of supplying yarn at cheap rates, and the Government should buy all their requirements from handloom cloth.

**Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South):** I want to speak for a few minutes. I wish to support the Bill.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I cannot allow it.

**Shri Dhulekar:** I won't take much time—not more than five minutes.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat. I did not allow any hon. Member to speak for more than five minutes. Therefore, that is no concession in my favour. Already I allowed so many persons to speak in the Third Reading. I took the time much against the decision of the Advisory Committee. There is the other Bill pending. Of course, some people wanted to speak yesterday. Mr. Rajabhoj went away in a huff. He would also like to speak.

**Shri Dhulekar** rose—

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** All right. Mr. Rajabhoj.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (शोलापुर—  
रक्षित—प्रतुसूचित जातियों) : उपाध्यक्ष  
महोदय, मैं इस पर बहुत कुछ बोलना चाहता  
था, पर आज मैं अपने नोट नहीं लाया हूँ।  
मैं कामर्स मिनिस्टर साहब से यह कहना  
चाहता हूँ कि मैं जिस कांस्टीट्यूएन्सी पानी  
शोलापुर से आता हूँ वहाँ हॉटलूम से काम  
करने वाले लोग बहुत ज्यादा रहते हैं।  
मुझे डर है कि इससे उनको कोई लाभ होगा  
या नहीं। यह जो धोती की सप्लाई का सवाल  
है इससे ब्लैक मार्केट करने वालों को बहुत  
फायदा होने वाला है। न मासूम गवर्नमेंट  
क्या करना चाहती है। उसके दिमाग  
में कमी कुछ आता है और कमी कुछ आता है।  
हमको इस बात की ज्यादा से ज्यादा जरूरत

[श्री पी० एन० राजभोज]

है कि जो पैसा धोती के टैक्स से प्राप्ति उसका उपयोग हैडलूम का काम करने वालों के लाभ के लिये किया जाय। बैकवर्ड क्लास के लोग जो कि वीवर हैं, मैं चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट उनके लिये उस पैसे को खर्च करे। उनके लिये कोम्पारेटिव सोसाइटियाँ बनावे और जो उनका कपड़ा तैयार हो उसकी गवर्नमेंट शाप बनाकर बेचना चाहिये। अस्पतालों में और मिलिटरी में हैडलूम का कपड़ा काम में लाया जाय। जिस तरह गवर्नमेंट खादी के लिये कर रही है वैसे ही हैडलूम के वास्ते करना चाहिये। जैसे कि वह कर दिया गया है कि जो सूदर की टोपी पहनेगा वही कांग्रेस का मेम्बर होगा। बंसी ही कोई कमीशन हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब हैडलूम के कपड़े के लिये बना दें। मिनिस्टर महोदय मेरी बातों की ओर ध्यान दें। हमारे कामर्स मिनिस्टर साहब बातें कर रहे हैं उनको सुनने का टाइम नहीं है।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** सुन रहें हैं। उनके कान ध्रापके साथ हैं।

**श्री पी० एन० राजभोज :** मैं ध्राप के जरिये मिनिस्टर साहब से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उनके पास हैडलूम के लिए कोई स्कीम है। मेरे ब्याल से तो उन के पास कोई स्कीम नहीं है। केवल उन्होंने एक छोटा सा बिल बना दिया है और इसके लिए उन्होंने कोई शक्ति खर्च नहीं की है। तो मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हैडलूम से काम करने वाले हैं उनको लाभ होना चाहिए। उनका माल अस्पतालों में, मिलिटरी में और जैसा कि राशनिंग का कंट्रोल बना दिया था उसी प्रकार कंट्रोल बनाकर खपाया जाय। यह किया जाय कि इतना इतना माल हैडलूम का लेना होगा। ऐसा जब तक नहीं होता है

तब तक इन लोगों को ज्यादा सपोर्ट नहीं मिल सकती है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि जो सूदर की टोपी पहनने वाले हैं उन पर टैक्स लगा दिया जाय तो बहुत अच्छा होगा क्योंकि यह तो गवर्नमेंट की निश्चानी है। इन लोगों पर टैक्स लगाना चाहिए और जो हमारे हैडलूम से काम करने वाले हैं इनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहायित देनी चाहिए।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is khaddar manufactured in mills?

**श्री पी० एन० राजभोज :** सूदर पर भी टैक्स लगाना चाहिए। इससे गवर्नमेंट को पैसा मिलेगा।

**एक नामगोप्य सदस्य :** वह भी तो हैडलूम है।

**श्री पी० एन० राजभोज :** वह तो चरखा है। चरखे और हैडलूम में बहुत फर्क है।

हैडलूम इंडस्ट्री के जो लोग हैं, उनके लिए ज्यादा से ज्यादा लाभ हो, इसकी कोशिश करने के लिए गवर्नमेंट के पास कोई स्कीम नहीं है और वह कोई स्कीम बनाती भी नहीं है। मेरे ब्याल से यह जो बिल है, इसका कोई अच्छा नतीजा नहीं निकलेगा। इस से ब्लैक मारकेट वालों का फायदा होगा, मिल वालों को ज्यादा लाभ होगा। सात रुपये की धोती लेने को कोई जायेगा तो दूसरे ब्लैक मारकेट वाले लोग साढ़े सात और घाट रुपया लेंगे। इसका नतीजा इस तरह ठीक नहीं निकलेगा। इसके लिये गवर्नमेंट को कोई ठोस स्कीम बनानी चाहिये जिस से कि जो गरीब मजदूर काम करने वाले हैं उन के लिये जो बड़े बड़े मिस्स हैं उन में नीकरी मिल सके। इस के लिये सरकार की कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

हैंड वीविंग हो नहीं, कोई न कोई स्कीम बनानी चाहिये और स्कीम बनाने के बाद गरीबों का फायदा होना चाहिये यही मेरा कहना है।

अभी क्या हालत है कि बोलापुर में बहुत लोग बेकार हैं; उनकी काम नहीं मिलता है, भन्सा नहीं मिलता है। नवर्नमेंट कहती है धान मिल जायगा, लेकिन वह मिलता नहीं है। उसकी हालत खराब हो रही है। तो इस के लिये नवर्नमेंट की यूजीकाम पालिसी नहीं है। यह जो पांच सात मिनट का टाइम था उस में जो कुछ कहना था वह कह दिया। अब दूसरा टाइम आयेगा तो बात करूंगा। हमने जो कहा है उसको हमारे कामर्स मिनिस्टर साहब अच्छी तरह से दिमाग में लाकर देखें और हमारी हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री के जो लोग हैं उन के लिये अच्छी स्कीम बनावें जिस से उन का लाभ हो।

**Shri Dhulekar:** Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me a few minutes time

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The only difficulty that I feel is that hon. Members come once in a blue moon and as soon as they come they want to catch my eye. I find it very difficult.

**Shri Dhulekar:** I only want to clarify the atmosphere that has been made very tense and thick on account of several arguments that have been brought in, although I would say that they are not relevant at this stage. The point is very clear that all sections of this House have supported the proposition that it is very necessary that the handloom industry should be supported, and that the handloom industry can only be supported by giving it some protection. Now, the Opposition benches supported the opinion of Sbrri Rajagopalachari that all the dhoti quota of this country should be handed over to the handloom industry.

**An Hon. Member:** But the Congress benches would not support it.

**Shri Dhulekar:** If we consider that proposition, everybody will agree that a full stop cannot be put upon the manufacture of dhoties all over the country and therefore a beginning has to be made. Now, we began with 60 per cent. and we levied a duty and also said that there should be a quota which will be 60 per cent.

Now, I put this very straight question. What is the objection? You want 100 per cent.; I give you 60 per cent. as a beginning. Let the handloom industry take over charge of a some percentage of the dhoties of India and later a 75 per cent. quota will be given to them. Sir, first of all we passed the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development (Additional Excise Duty on Cloth) Act, 1953, (XII 1953). Now, what is the logical conclusion? The logical conclusion is that that if any mills do not accept the request made by the Indian people that they should help the handloom industry by restricting themselves only to a certain percentage, what should the Government or the hon. Minister do? Some people say that people should be sent to jail and they should be punished. I say that it is civil law and you are not making an Indian Penal Code. Mills and Companies are not individuals that particular persons can be punished. Now, for argument's sake, I put this question. How to punish them? Here it is suggested that we have to fix a quota by taking the average for the last year. The average cannot be a definite quantity because things are produced from day to day and certain calculations have to be made. Therefore the mills cannot say that they will have only 2 lakhs or 3 lakhs of dhoties. That average is indefinite. We have also to make a provision as to what should be done if they made a certain percentage above the fixed one. Some people will say punish them. I say that they have been punished in this very proper manner that their error will be condoned to a

[Shri Dhulekar]

particular extent and if they do commit that error to a larger extent, then they will have to pay 2 annas, then 3 annas, then 5 annas and then 8 annas per yard. This is the penalty they have to pay.

Most of my hon. friends have read into this Bill a help to the mill-owners. I, Sir, for one, cannot read that meaning into this Bill at all. What do they want? They want that after passing that Ordinance we should keep mum; we should say that it should be 60 per cent. Suppose it is more than that; what should be done? So, I would say, whatever possible has been done and a provision has been made.

Now, people talk of unemployment, want of handloom industries in Rajasthan, in Uttar Pradesh and all that. I do not join issue with them that the handloom industries are not in a bad condition. I do not say that you should not organise co-operative societies all over India and help the handloom industry. I do not say that they should not do it and the hon. Minister of Commerce also does not say that. I say that every effort will be made to organise co-operative societies for having handloom industries all over India and within a year or six months we shall have a network of handloom industries all over the country. I say, Sir, that that point may be germane to this, but to say that because handloom industries have not been started, therefore, this Bill should be thrown out, I cannot support.

With these few words, Sir, I support the Bill.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I thought, that after speaking for about 50 minutes—with digressions, undoubtedly—I had explained the position in regard to this Bill. But I am sorry to see that I have not made myself clear again. May I re-state the position, Sir?

In November 1952, in order to help the handloom industry and in response to a demand that came, particularly from the South, Government by the power vested in them under the Textile Control Order limited the production of dhoties by mills to 60 per cent. of what they produced during the peak period. That order was in operation practically from January. The over-all result was that we were able to restrict the production of dhoties to 60 per cent. It came to 29,000 bales a month which was less than 60 per cent. of the production during the peak period and about 64 per cent. of the normal period. The result of it was that the price of mill-made dhoties went up. It went up to 40 per cent. in the case of superfine and 15 to 30 per cent. in the case of medium and fine. That was the culmination that was desired by restriction of production. If production is restricted, naturally the price of that commodity goes up.

An Hon. Member: Who is benefited?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I will come to that. Then the price went up. As a result of the prices going up, the handloom industry in South India did benefit to some extent. It may be that it did not get the amount of satisfaction that was necessary for the handloom weaver, but there is no denying that he has benefited because the consumption of mill-made dhoties in Madras had come down by 80 per cent.—that was what I said yesterday. But, Sir, the prices of mill-made dhoties in Orissa, in Bengal, in Bihar, in Uttar Pradesh, in Rajasthan and in the Punjab went up, and so the Governments of various States did not react very favourably because the problem of dhoti—handloom weaving—was not one that was very prominently before them. They had the problem of handloom weavers and undoubtedly, every State has it, but it is not so much a question of dhoties and saris for them, and, therefore,—I am not disclosing any secret which ought not to be disclosed—the Governments of Bengal, Orissa, Bihar and



U.P. did not like this measure and did protest against the restriction. They said "You must make an exception in our favour". Having agreed to a policy which had to benefit the handloom industry—this country being one and we can only legislate for the entire country—Government had to stick to their views. My hon. friend on this side from U.P., who is a very mild and meek man, did get excited and angry with me. I did not follow all that he said, but I felt that he was completely displeased because he thought that this was a retrograde measure.

**Babu Ramnarayan Singh:** Certainly.

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** Shri Ramnarayan Singh is an old friend and also an obstinate friend who will never change. The point really is that he did not understand that I have to face his Government. His Government is a popularly elected government and has probably a right equal to the right that he possesses over me to tell me "You are wrong" and the Government has said it in so many words. My position is an unfortunate one. I might believe, as Shri Kelappan says, in large scale industries; I might not believe in small scale industries. I might have read about the French Revolution as he has read, a little more or a little less, and I know the philosophy of hunger. I do not mind confessing here that I came here at 10 minutes to 2 as I thought the question hour would be gone through quickly and this Bill will also be disposed of and I could and so I have not had my lunch before I came. So I do know the philosophy of hunger very well—the handloom weaver goes without food for a whole day and I go without my lunch or coffee, these do not matter much—and we all know the same philosophy and believe in it, but then belief and practice have got to be synthesised in relation to the circumstances that prevail. Here is Orissa from which Shri Sarangdhar Das comes and in his province, my hon. friend and predecessor told me that he cannot go into the villages because the prices of dhoties

have gone up by 40 per cent. and people complain. It is a grim fact and I do realise that the prices have gone up because we have had a restriction and it was intended that the price of mill-made dhoti should go up so that the handloom weaver, whose cost of production is high because the industry is labour intensive, cannot sell his goods. That is what happens when we try to seek a short-cut remedy and to achieve quick results, and somebody does suffer—it is a fact—and the same is the case in Bengal. It is not that my friend, the Chief Minister, wanted to disobey any law but he had to face the problem of his people having to pay 30 to 40 per cent. more for their dhoties. This was the problem right at his doors. In practically the same way, Shri C. Rajagopalachariar had the question of the hungry handloom weaver right at his doors. The problems vary from State to State. The problem which a Chief Minister of one State has to face is none the less intensive, though it differs from the problem in another State. That is why we thought of putting an additional check on these mills by saying that if there is any deviation, that deviation will be limited by the force of circumstances and the penal levy. Then the idea that the mill-owner can make money by selling in black-market, as my hon. friend said, will not carry him far. If he makes money by selling a portion of it at black-market prices he will have to pay us a portion of his profit and there is some check. The powers that the Government possesses under the Textile Control Order still remain. Those powers have got to be tested. We can prosecute. Tomorrow I can reduce the percentage to 50 and I don't have to come to Parliament for it, though ultimately for every action of mine I am responsible to the Members of Parliament. We are democratic body notwithstanding the fact that my friend over there, who looks at it from a warped angle naturally because of circumstances, in which he is found, thinks it is not democratic. Therefore, if I want to reduce it to 50 per cent., I could reduce it under the powers vested in me by the

[Sbri T. T. Krishnamachari]

Textile Control Order If my hon. friend from U.P. wants to reduce the percentage and if he could convince the Chief Minister and Ministers in U.P. that that is proper, I am prepared to reduce it, if necessary to 50 per cent. So far as this measure is concerned, it will only affect when the mills manufacture beyond 60 per cent. But I have got other powers which I could exercise. I can, for instance, stop the supply of cotton to a mill which misbehaves. If I do that, what happens? Let me tell you an instance. There was a mill—Raj Kumar Mill in Indore—which misbehaved for a different reason and I had to stop supply of cotton to it. But what happened? 2,500 labourers were thrown out and I had to eat the humble pie and to give the mill, cotton again. It is not a question of punishing the mill-owner, but it is a question of punishing the labour.

**Shri S. S. More:** Can you not punish the owner or the manager?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I can do very much more than Shri More thinks of if I have the power. Shri More is a lawyer and a very profound one in that he knows the Constitution and he knows also that I am fettered by the Constitution in regard to my free movement. To come back to this Bill, this is not a support to any mill-owner. It does not help the capitalist. You may say that it does not help the handloom weaver anything more than what the Order of November 1952 has done. It is true. This does more or less crystallise the position of my Order of November 1952 in that I have compelled the mills to stick to 60 per cent. and for marginal adjustments they will have to pay penalty. If the mills, however, go beyond the limits of penalty, I can take other measures. It may be by cutting down the supply of cotton to them. There are other methods also to which I can take action.

**Shri Kelappan:** Why can you not make the duty prohibitive?

**Shri T. T. Krishnamachari:** I can make it so, but Shri Kelappan is looking at the problem from one point of view only, namely, the handloom weaver's point of view. He does not appreciate that it means that we would then punish the consumer. That is why in spite of my ideological differences with a person like Shri Hiren Mukerjee, I do realise the words uttered by him, "We are suffering from illusions and we feel that those illusions will be realised by abort cuts." He is right and I cannot but acknowledge that, but the whole trouble is that the world is so different, economic factors are so varied and problems vary from State to State, so much so even Providence fails sometimes, to find a remedy suitable to all. I am afraid. I will give this assurance to hon. Members if they have any misconception on this. This is not sliding down from the position taken in November 1952; on the other hand it is strengthening that position. If I find that the position is really deteriorating, let me give the assurance to hon. Members in all solemnity that I have other powers to compel the mills to see that they do not transgress the stipulated limits. If I want more powers, I will come and tell the hon. Members that I want more powers. But for God's sake let them not misunderstand the position. There is no need for alarm even though the position of the handloom weaver is bad. Mr. Kelappan is not right in saying that I have got an inhuman heart. It is not a stony heart, and I wish to say it is as soft as he possesses. There is no use his accusing me. I know Mr. Kelappan would not say or use a language which is improvised for the time being as my friend Mr. Gidwani did as what he said that it is a patent abuse and nothing else. Yes; he stated something about vanaspathi as if he is the only person to have the right to be patriotic. But I am sorry, Sir, that being psychopathological is not patriotic. I do not want to exchange any more words with him, Sir. Finally, I give this assurance to hon. Members. Let

them not have any doubt about it: the position of the handloom weaver will not deteriorate by this measure and we hope that it will be strengthened. If it does deteriorate, I shall come and tell the Members that it has deteriorated and then we must seek other remedies to strengthen the position. But then let them understand that in strengthening the position of the handloom weaver by means of this restriction we cannot escape the inescapable; that is all such measures raise the price of mill dhoties to weavers in very many areas where mill dhoties are used.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

*The motion was adopted.*

**INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill.

**Clause 2.—(Amendment of section 2)**

**Shri K. K. Desai (Halar):** I beg to move:

In page 1, line 12,—

omit "paid or"

In page 1, line 24,—

omit "paid or"

**Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang):** I beg to move:

In page 2,—

(i) in line 3, for "uninterrupted service" substitute "uninterrupted employment which has not been earlier terminated expressly by the employer"; and

(ii) omit lines 4 to 7.

**Shri A. N. Vidyalkar (Jullundur):** I beg to move:

In page 2, line 3,—

for "uninterrupted service" substitute "uninterrupted employment".

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** I beg to move:

In page 2,—

for lines 3 to 7 substitute—

"(eee) 'continuous service' means uninterrupted service, and includes service which may be interrupted merely on account of sickness, or accident, or such absence on account of family events as may be prescribed, or military service, or the exercise of civil rights and duties, or changes in the management of the undertaking, or intermittent involuntary unemployment if the duration of the unemployment does not exceed a prescribed limit and if the person concerned resumes employment, or pregnancy and confinement if her absence does not exceed a prescribed period."

**Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam):** I beg to move:

In page 2, line 6,—

after "illegal" insert "or lock-out, or closure, or lay off"

**Shri A. N. Vidyalkar:** I beg to move:

In page 2, line 6,—

after "illegal" insert "or lay-off, lock-out or closure, or due to unavoidable climatic reasons"

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

In page 2, line 6,—

after "illegal" insert "or lock-out or lay off"

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

In page 2, line 11,—

after "expressions" add "including lock-out"

**Shri K. K. Desai:** I beg to move:

In page 2, line 14,—

omit "similar"