

Mr. Speaker: This is what the Finance Minister said. I am just quoting from proceedings:

"There was a week-end in between and they were very long memoranda. We said we will do our best and see whether we would be able to supply 500 copies. They have to be cyclo-styled and so on. That is what I said."

Of course, the wording does not specifically mention that he undertook to circulate it.

Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour): He does not deny it.

Mr. Speaker: No, he does not. The position is, they have placed on the Table 11 copies. If the hon. Members want that the copies should be circulated—well, for the time being the copies on the Table may be taken advantage of as far as possible—I think more copies should be struck and circulated in the course of a day or two. Today is Wednesday, and there is other business in between.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: In view of the fact that this Bill may not come up this week, I think circulation would be a better method.

Mr. Speaker: That is what I am saying. As there is other business and this Bill is not likely to come up for at least three or four days, copies can be struck and circulated, as early as possible. I find there are only about ten or twelve sheets. Hon. Members may also side by side go through them—that does not mean that there will be no circulation—because there will be no further postponement of the consideration of the Bill on the ground that a particular Member or two Members or ten Members did not receive a copy in time.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The specific point is that getting typed copies circulated will not take five days.

Mr. Speaker: I am leaving it to the Finance Ministry to have the copies struck, when we have ample time now.

The Bill is not likely to come up for three or four days at least and if the Members are keen on it the Finance Ministry can have copies struck and circulated by tomorrow or the day after by the latest.

DHOTIES (ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTY) Bill—contd.

Mr. Speaker: The House will proceed with the 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.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): Yesterday, I said the hon. Minister of Commerce and Industry was accusing me that I was labouring under a misconception. The point I was driving at was this, Sir. While an excise duty was sought to be imposed upon the production of dhoties for the purpose of helping the handloom industry, a large loophole was left open. It was not a loophole but a broad gateway. I was saying that a broad loophole was left open and that was this: that there was no restraint at all upon the production of sarees. This production of sarees is increasing apace. I shall presently place the facts, Sir, which would drive home my arguments.

[**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** in the Chair]

I have before me the figures for the production of dhoties and sarees separately. In 1950, for the calendar year, the total production was 199,602 bales—an average of 16,634 bales per month. The production of sarees in the same year was to the tune of 224,725 bales—an average of 18,707 bales per month. In 1951, an enormous increase in the production of both varieties was witnessed. For the calendar year 1951, the total production of dhoties was of the order of 500,864 bales—at an average of 41,722 bales per month. With regard to the sarees, it was 238,404 with an average of 19,867 bales. In 1952, Sir,.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may be a little more cool when he refers to sarees.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: In 1952, the total production of dhoties was 482,163 bales at an average of 40,180 bales per month. Production of sarees was to the tune of 377,907 bales with an average of 31,492 bales. For the ten months of 1953, Sir, the total is: for dhoties 298,813 bales and for sarees 288,075 bales. I submit, Sir, there is an alarming increase in the production of sarees and unless a restriction is placed also on the production of sarees, the good intention of the Government to help the handloom industry will not materialize at all. I do not know what made Mr. Heda say that the position of the handloom industry has improved. It is not so, Sir. The position in Madras State, particularly, is very bad and the situation is even now going from bad to worse. Unless there is, as has been stated repeatedly, elsewhere, reservation of dhoties and sarees exclusively for the handloom industry, I submit there is absolutely no hope of the survival of the handloom industry. The position that had been stated by the composite Legislative Assembly of Madras has now been restated by the newly formed Andhra Government and they say that reservation of sarees and dhoties for the handloom industry is absolutely essential for the preservation of the handloom industry. They go further and say that yarn must be made available to the handloom industry at the rate at which it is available at the mills plus the handling charges, in which case, I am sure, Sir, the handloom industry will certainly thrive.

The hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry yesterday put forward an argument that it is bad enough for one industry to be a parasite upon the other. I do not know what he meant by saying one industry being a parasite upon the other. Perhaps he meant that the handloom industry was thriving at the expense

of the mill industry. I submit, Sir, the position is the reverse: it is the mill industry which is thriving at the expense of the handloom industry. All these dhoties and sarees were being produced only by the handloom industry before the mills came into being. The history of the mills is not very long. At best, it can be traced back to only half a century ago. Therefore, it would be correct to say that the mills are thriving upon the destruction of the handloom industry.

One curious argument that has been advanced by the mill-owners is that the handloom industry is so specialised, its products are so beautiful, that they are fit only for export. They proceed further and argue that the entire internal market must be reserved for the mill industry. It is surprising that the mill industry which has got enormous financial resources at its command, which has got all the engines of propaganda and publicity at its command, should ask for the reservation of the internal market for itself and try to drive out the handloom industry for export trade. Let me cite the instance of Japan to our mill-owners. Japan which lay prostrate in 1946 has staged a tremendous come-back all within a short period of six or seven years to such an extent that she is now able to compete in the world market with England, United States of America and India. How has she been able to achieve this? I would suggest that our mill-owners should study the methods by which Japan has been able to make so much headway in the world markets in so short a period. Japan is now trying to launch upon an export drive and not thrive at the expense of the small industries in the internal market.

I, therefore submit, Sir, that though this measure is welcome, it does not meet the situation wholly. It is a half-hearted measure. What is necessary is to take a stronger step to

[Shri V. Ramaswamy]

protect the handloom industry and help it.

Now, let me read the definition of the word 'dhoti' as given in the Bill.

Clause 2(a) (ii) says:

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

... (ii) contains coloured yarn on its borders."

This definition, as it is, provides a very big loophole for the mill-owners to escape. Supposing no coloured yarn is on its borders, but the border is plain white? Then, they can manufacture dhoties non-challantly: you cannot catch them and bring them to book. They will take advantage of this clause and produce such varieties that do not have coloured yarn on the borders. I, therefore, submit that it is very necessary that this sub-clause should be deleted.

As I have urged, Sir, the proper measure to take is punitive action and not imposition of this duty. If criminal action cannot be thought of for any reason, if Government think that this is the only way to curb the open defiant attitude of the mill-owners, I submit, Sir, the rate of duty given in the schedule is not enough. It is not deterrent enough to prevent them from manufacturing more than their quota. In the amendments notice of which I have given, I have sought to raise the duty to make them deterrent. My hon. friends from Bengal and other places have urged that on account of curtailment of mill-made dhotis prices are going up. I appeal to them, Sir, in the name of those one crore of our fellow citizens, men, women and children of the weaving classes, the flesh of our flesh and the blood of our blood, those who are shivering in cold and hunger, so buy handloom cloth and encourage this industry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A number of hon. Members want to participate in

the discussion. Enough has already been said. If there are new points hon. Members may refer to them. If there are very old points which ought to be impressed or stressed, they may do so lightly.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav (Ambad): Doubts have been expressed by so many hon. Members as to whether this measure would serve the object which has been enunciated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to it. Of course, if that objective would be achieved by this measure it should be supported unanimously. But, in my opinion, this measure would not fulfil the object of giving encouragement to the handloom industry. On the other hand it may have a contrary effect. If the intention of the Government was to encourage the handloom industry there should have been some more deterrent steps adopted by way of legislation. This Bill instead of deterring the mills, will give them a licence to produce dhotis and sarees as they like, if only they pay the additional excise duty. If Government had announced or asked mill-owners not to produce dhoties more than sixty per cent of their average production during the period April 1951 to March 1952 and if, as has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons to this Bill, some mills or units produced more dhoties in excessive quantity, my question is why those mills were not taken to task and why extra production was not confiscated. That was the best way to check this over-production and that was the proper punishment to give to the units which contravened this order of the Government.

Instead of doing that, what is sought by way of this Bill is just to levy some extra charges. That is to say, if some mills produce more quantities, if the excess is up to 12½ per cent, some two annas per yard is to be charged; if the excess is 25 per cent, three annas; if the excess

is 50 per cent., four annas; and over 50 per cent. eight annas.

This shows that mills are given a licence to produce as much as possible—simply pay the duty and finish up the matter. I think this will have effect in other ways. Moreover this will be a licence to millowners to charge extra on dhoties. The ordinary purchaser will not be able to know whether a particular dhoti is produced by way of extra quantity or whether it comes in the category of production of more than 12½ per cent. or 25 per cent. or 50 per cent. or whether it is in the fourth category. The consumer will be charged by the millowner or by the shop-keeper in whatever manner he likes. But the consumer will not be in a position to know whether it is within the limited production or whether it comes in the category of two annas, three annas, four annas or eight annas extra charge. Whatever charges the shop-keeper or millowner demands, the consumer will have to pay. And that is the reason why everywhere, immediately the order was passed, dhoties have become rather dearer in the market. Nobody will know whether a particular dhoti or a particular stock belongs to the category of extra production or comes out of the normal production within the limits allowed to the mills. In this way the consumer is required to pay more price. Mills are given a licence to produce as much quantity as they want and everywhere there will be a black market and a sort of mismanagement, and the object of this Bill will not be served. The very purpose of this Bill be affected in this way. And instead of giving help to handlooms—there will be no help—at all—on the other hand it will have effect in the other direction.

As has been suggested by so many Members, the definition of "dhoties" is also defective and some way will be found by millowners that it does

not come under the definition of "dhoti".

In this way the Bill seems to be defective and it requires so many changes. It cannot be effected by amendments. The Bill ought to have been drafted properly and carefully, which has not been done.

Of course the object of the Bill is quite all right. If the object is served we can all support it. But in its present form the Bill can hardly be supported, and though the object is a good one, the purpose will not be served.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): I am somewhat in an embarrassing position because I do not know whether I can, consistently with the interests of the vast number of consumers that I represent, support this Bill. Similarly it is very difficult for me to oppose it for the simple reason that this Bill, according to its objective, is sought to be introduced and passed for the benefit of the handloom workers. However, what I want to say is that if the object of the Bill is to give additional protection and encouragement to the handloom industry, then the way in which the scheme of the Bill is framed is least likely to achieve that object.

The graded scale of duty will not affect if the millowner or manufacturer finds that the prices are attractive. He will pay—whether it is 12½ per cent. or 25 per cent. and so on and so on—he will continue to pay that additional excise duty so long as the price is attractive.

What does it indicate? If the price is attractive, it is not only attractive for the additional production, that is over and above the 60 per cent. but it is attractive to the entire production of the mill. In other words the prices are expected to go up, and this is something which has actually happened.

If the House remembers, in the year 1950 the production of dhoties and

[Shri Gadgil]

sarees went down so much that the average per month of sales of dhoties was about 16,000 and of sarees 18,000. There was a huge cry in the country. Prices had gone up so much and there was scarcity of dhoties and sarees with the result that in the month of February 1951 Government directed the mills to reserve 50 per cent. of their loomage for the production of sarees and dhoties. Because, Government intended that there should be greater production and greater supply of this kind of stuff so that the prices may come down or at any rate there must be enough to meet the demand. The result was that from February 1951 the production of this kind of cloth went up, and the average for the year 1951 was 41,722 bales of dhoties and 19,867 bales of sarees.

Such was the position by the end of 1951, and the same position continued right up to the month of December, 1952 when there was a sudden change in the policy.

3 P.M.

The first emphasis was on giving relief to the consumer, in terms of quantity at any rate and in terms of price if possible. Then the emphasis shifted, and it shifted from coming to the help of the consumer to going to the help of the producer, namely the handloom worker. The result was that the Government levied an excise duty and the production had gone down: 40 per cent. reduction straightaway. Today, as a result, prices have gone up. The Government took the risk of decontrol; the prices went down by about 15 to 20 per cent. But, this margin was immediately made up the moment the Government decided to levy some sort of a duty for the purpose of protecting the handloom stuff. The consumer is left high and dry. As I said, I find myself in a very embarrassing position. We have just to strike some sort of a mean between the conflicting interests and try to find out if,

without withdrawing substantially the promised aid and protection to the handloom worker, we could not do something for the consumer.

I understand from the Census report that the total number of workers dependent on the handloom industry is just 21 lakhs and the number of looms is 24 lakhs. But, the sample survey initiated at the instance of the Textile Enquiry Committee showed that all these 24 lakhs of handlooms are not working; about 55 per cent. are working. Assuming that two persons are necessary for working one loom, it roughly comes to about two million. We have to take into consideration the employment interests of these 2 million people. On the other hand, we have 34 crores of consumers. When I put this particular point of view before the House, I am not blind to the fact that the obligation of employing every able-bodied man in this country is on the Government, that the economy of the country should be so arranged that none should be found unemployed if he is willing to do work. But, the question really arises, can all this be done by this method. All along, we were under the impression that the Government was evolving a policy by which the consumer will have a fair price, labourers will have fair wages and mill-owners or manufacturers will have a fair return on their capital. What I have found in the course of the last 6 years is that whatever happens, the consumer may suffer, may go without cloth, the labourers, wherever they are not properly organised, may also suffer, but in no case have the manufacturers suffered. They have really put the Government of the day on the mat. You can find out from the figures that in 1948 January or February, Government decided to decontrol. Within 3 or 4 months prices shot up and the result was that control had to be re-imposed. But, in between the

two moments according to the calculation made by my hon. friend Shri K. K. Desai, the mill owners pocketed 200 crores of rupees. Even this year, two Ordinances were passed very recently;—I have nothing to say because this is not the occasion.—but I have got an impression and I am confirmed in that impression. When only last month I visited Ahmedabad and had some talk with people who are in the know of things, they said: it is all right because we are big mill-owners; but the smaller uneconomic units will go to dogs; so much the better for us; there will be less competition. In other words, whatever the Government does in order to help the down-trodden people, the result is that the upper dog gets the benefit. This has been the history of the handling of the textile industry by this Government. I am sorry to say that the time has now come when this industry must be nationalised. So long as you are dealing with this problem in this piecemeal uncoordinated manner, you cannot eliminate competition between the handloom stuff and the mill made stuff. You might put an additional duty on production in a mill or you might do this or that. The fact remains that the two things compete in the open market. Therefore, the better method would be that the Government should take over the entire production of the handlooms. It is not very difficult. Have not Government enough experience in the procurement of cereals? When millions of peasants were brought within the system of procurement, it was not found very difficult. If there were certain defects, by the experience by now those defects could be got over. The Government should take over the entire production of the handloom industry. Also, if they cannot straightaway nationalise and take over the textile industry, at any rate, they should fix a price schedule and take over the entire production of the mills and pool them together. In that way, the consumers' interests will be protected. After all, what are economic activities for? It is for the consumer

that every economic activity is directed. Whatever you produce in industry or in the agricultural field, it is ultimately meant for the consumer. Here is your policy. I do not accuse the Government because I know that they mean well. But, what are the results of the policy that has been followed so far, and that is proposed to be followed? The result will be, again, the consumer will be getting less.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Gwalior): The consumer will be consumed.

Shri Gadgil: He is presuming too much. The point is that the Government instead of dealing with this problem....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Government is concerned only with the consumer and not the employment of persons?

Shri Gadgil: I wish they were so. But, the fact is that actually in 1950, when production was considerably less, Government came to the rescue and the emphasis was on giving help and protection to the consumer. Later on, when production rose, when the stuff was available, prices were going down. There was a turn in the policy, as I said, for the purpose of giving some employment to these two million people. In doing that, as I said, the larger interests of the consumers were slightly given a left-handed treatment.

What I am suggesting is this. There is a way, there must be found out a way whereby these two interests could be combined. The Government should deal with the whole industry in an integrated manner. As I have said, there must be a price pool. There is another way in which it could be done. The main point is to avoid competition between the two. They can reserve a sphere for handloom stuff and another sphere either in terms of territory or in terms of quality to the mills. Or, just as in the rationing system, at any rate in Poona, some good rice was given, but some bad

[Shri Gadgil]

rice had to be taken; otherwise, you cannot get ration, similarly, when the Government combine the whole thing, they can insist that for every ten yards of mill-made cloth, a man must buy two yards of handloom. That is one way of doing the thing. Another way, as I suggested the other day, is this. The Government, in paying their employees in semi-governmental institutions, in organised industry, instead of giving 100 per cent. current currency, can give 95 per cent. and 5 per cent. credit notes or coupons which will be valid tender only for the purpose of buying articles manufactured in the cottage industry sphere. These are 3 or 4 ways in which it could be done.

But, so long as you allow the competition in the open market between the two, there is no possibility that both will survive. Ultimately, the handloom will go to dogs. What will happen in the long run when we are thinking of rapid industrialisation, and very rightly, is a matter for the future to consider, but in the present context when you are emphasizing the employment aspect—I have no quarrel with it—you must not neglect the interests of the consumers whom at any rate, I have the honour to represent along with most others, although personally I do not use mill cloth.

These are the things I wanted to suggest.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): I am happy that I speak after my hon. friend, Mr. Gadgil has spoken, because so often I have a feeling that perhaps one of these days, not before long, we shall find him sitting on our side of the House.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): Come here and sit next to him.

Shri Gadgil: He can come here nearer. It is all the same.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: He made observations with which I found myself very largely in agreement, and I am happy that he has brought to

the fore with all the strength which his presentation commands certain points which I am sure Government ought to take into consideration.

I listened with much interest, as I always do, to my hon. friend, the Minister for Commerce and Industry, when he moved the consideration of this Bill. But, I fear, Sir, that he tried to low-light the real character of this legislation by merely pointing to its *ad hoc* necessity. It may be that for certain purposes, particularly for the purpose of assisting the cause of the handloom industry, it may be necessary for us to restrict the production of dhoties to a certain extent. How far we should go and how we should go is, of course, a different matter, but I admit that it may be necessary to restrict production, but the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry naturally did not tell the House anything about the implications of this measure, because, if he went a little deeply into the implications of this measure, it would have shown up the completely inept handling of the textile crisis in this country by this Government.

Now, Sir, there is crisis in the textile industry, and to quote the President of the West Bengal Mill Owners' Association, it is in Bengal a greater crisis than elsewhere. And so, it is in order to help the country out of this crisis that Government has come forward with certain proposals. It is very ironic that usually the cry is that the workers are lazy, that they are not producing. Usually, the demand is for increase of production, but as soon as there is a slight increase, there is a howl regarding over-production. There is a talk about what is put more delicately in the "Eastern Economist" of the 2nd October, as "the necessity of a certain amount of labour displacement". I also observe very threatening statements which are coming now from the side of those who are in control of this industry.

We know, and Mr. Gadgil has already emphasized it, that, generally speaking, the mill-owners,—and especially, the bigger the mill-owner the more rapacious his ideas—when-ever they find that there is a setback to demand on some scale and as a result there is a threat to the prospect of the kind of profit they desire, resort to the ready remedy of closure, as if to hold the community to ransom. That is exactly what they were trying to do, and the Minister, in his statement when he issued the Ordinances, said that panicky pronouncements were made and somewhat hastily notices were issued for the closure of shifts by certain mills, notably in Ahmedabad. These mill-owners do use this weapon for holding the community to ransom, and they are, even now, after the promulgation of these Ordinances, going on issuing rather in a meek and mild way, because they are complimenting the Commerce and Industry Minister very effusively, statements suggesting that very likely there is going to be unemployment, that very likely there is going to be retrenchment. I find, for example, it was stated in a special article in the "Eastern Economist" on the 2nd of October, 1953, that with its growing difficulties, the cotton mill industry can hardly afford to keep such a large and costly labour force employed for an indefinite period. It refers also to what it chooses to call "redundant production". That is the kind of thing which is being said by our mill-owners, and they are not satisfied entirely with what the hon. Commerce and Industry Minister has offered to them on a silver platter. They want something else. They want to have an abolition of the export duty on coarse goods altogether at the same time.

They have got a considerable amount of relief which has been computed by the capitalists themselves at about Rs. 6 Crores. Here I find that Government has a very queer way of looking after the welfare of the people as a whole. When the cotton mill industry is in difficulty, Government

assists them to the extent, monetarily speaking, of Rs. 6 Crores. When the handloom people are in difficulties, Government brought forward legislation here in this Parliament some time ago, and as a result of it, a special cess of Rs. 4 Crores had to be levied, but from the consumers. This is the way the Government behaves and today the Government is trying to cloud the issue by putting it forward that, after all, the handloom weavers are a very large chunk of the community, which is true—they are entitled to every sympathy—and that therefore, in order to save them, we must have this restriction. A sort of illusion is being sought to be created in the minds of the handloom workers, and the illusion is to the effect that if you stop the sale, if that is possible,—I think my hon. friend, Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava, even went so far as to suggest that the sale of mill-made dhoties and sarees should be stopped altogether here and now—of mill-made cloth altogether, then everything would be lovely in the garden and the handloom weavers in a most wonderful position. That is the kind of dangerous illusion which is being sought to be fostered, which is being placarded by this Government all over the place, and that is also being put forward as an excuse for this particular Bill now before us. I say, Sir, that it is completely a travesty of facts. As Mr. Gadgil also suggested, I would say that if Government really wanted to help the handloom weaver, why does it not come forward to buy up the entire production, or at least the major bulk of the production of the handloom industry. Why don't they use the production of the handloom industry in their own different departments and market it properly if they have the facilities and the apparatus to do so? Actually, I remember there was a suggestion that as far as things supplied to Members of Parliament when they live in Delhi are concerned, as far as furnishings or the kind of textile needs of the Parliamentary set-up of our country is concerned, we might use

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

only handloom products. We do not mind that at all. We welcome that kind of measure to assist the handloom industry, but nothing of the sort is being done. On the contrary, the idea is being propagated in their mind that everything would be all right once there is restriction of production. This shows to what lengths the Government and its friends in industry are prepared to go, how they are prepared to say good-bye to the real interests of the workers and the consumers as well as industry—because. I do not say for a moment that the interests of industry have to be obliterated. I do say that industry certainly requires assistance, if that assistance is justified, but the way the cotton mill industry is coming forward is a way which we cannot certainly support.

Besides, here is a measure which tries to restrict the production of dhoties. How are we going to solve the present crisis if we restrict the production of dhoties and if we try to increase exports and thereby help to bring some more profits to the coffers of the mill-owners? That is exactly what is sought to be done. The mill-owners are themselves shouting from the house-tops that lately exports have become a very difficult proposition. I think it was again, in 'The Eastern Economist' that I found it was stated on the 30th October, 1953:

"In the last nine months of this year, exports have amounted to only 500 million yards, as against a figure of 1,000 million yards, which was a target for a full year, arranged consistently with the Buxton Conference estimates. The effect of the abolition of the export duty on medium cloth and the drawback of import duty on super-fine cloth made of imported cottons, will probably have the effect of raising our exports in a full year to something like 800 million yards."

Again, as we know, on account of the competition from Japan and the U.S.A., and also the U.K., as far as the market in Singapore or Burma or Ceylon or Malaya or Pakistan or Hongkong is concerned, the possibilities of our exporting enough to these countries of South-east Asia are diminishing from day to day, and therefore exports are really very difficult on account of this strenuous competition. All the same, Government are going to give every possible encouragement to export, so that our mill-owners might get as much as possible into their pockets. I suggest that to try to solve the crisis by stepping up exports is fantastic. It is an absolutely impossible proposition.

I say also that the handloom worker and every other person in our country are all interested in one matter about which Government seem to be oblivious, and that is the production of yarn, or the supply of yarn. In Andhra, I find that the crisis in handloom industry has taken such a serious turn that there have been many arrests and lathi charges, and thousands of handloom weavers are demonstrating, and every day we get reports of hunger marches of these handloom weavers in Andhra-desh. The crisis of the handloom industry is due to a variety of factors, and at least one of those factors is the lack of supply of yarn. The emphasis on production of cloth in order to increase exports has continued for so long, because of this combination between Government and industry, and spinning has been neglected. I find from the figures, the production of yarn fell from 1447 million pounds in 1948 to 1175 pounds in 1950. So there was a drop of 272 million pounds in three years' time. This is the kind of thing which goes on. Even if Government and industry try to put a little more cloth into the market, because export is difficult, on the whole, our per capita consumption has not increased. Actually, in 1950-51, our per capita cloth consumption was only 9:70 yards. The official figures.

for 1951 and 1952 are 11·8 and 14 yards respectively. It is about 2½ yards less in 1952, than in 1939-40. If the Five Year Plan succeeds,—and as far as cotton textiles production is concerned, certainly it can succeed before time—the target to be achieved is 15 yards per capita. But here again, we find that they cannot sell the product. And I can quote 'The Eastern Economist', again asking for the reduction of prices of foodgrains and the return to the food subsidies, so that more money would be available, and there will be slightly more purchasing power in the hands of the people. The reduction of prices of cloth is therefore of absolute necessity. I would suggest that reduction of prices of cloth could be achieved, because there is enough room, especially as far as the bigger units of our textile production are concerned, for a substantial reduction of their cost of production. If the mill-owners cut down their heavy administrative expenses, if they take effective steps against mismanagement, and the vagaries of the managing agency system, if they satisfy themselves with a reasonable profit, then there might very well be a substantial reduction of prices. So, if we find on the part of the industry an attitude of co-operation, if Government remove or substantially reduce the excise duty on cloth, return to food subsidy, and strictly enforce price control of cloth, then of course, a considerable improvement in the present situation is quite possible.

We find that the wholesale prices of cotton manufactured articles are going up. The index shows that it was 389 on the 6th September 1952, while it was 408 on the 5th September 1953. That being the position, it is extremely important for Government to have a real plan for putting the industry on a really efficient basis, efficiency meaning that the profit motive will have to be beaten down at least as far as the interests of the total community today demand it. The step suggested by Government regarding the restriction of production

to 60% is going to mean that our monthly production of dhoties, which is about 50,000 bales, would be reduced to 30,000 bales. On this point, certain questions have been raised from the point of view of the West Bengal Mills.

What I find is that the restriction is not going to militate against the interests of the bigger units of the cotton mill industry, whether they are in Bombay or in West Bengal. It so happens that in West Bengal, there is perhaps one really big and efficient cotton mill, and that is a Birla Mill, which has got all the facilities, all the appurtenances, for conducting its operations, as efficiently as it can be done anywhere in India. In Madras also, there are, as you know very well, those companies operated by the Managing Agency firm of Binny and Company, who do not care a brass button whether you are going to produce dhoties and saris or not, because they produce other kinds of textiles, shirtings, longcloth, voiles, and heaven knows what other kinds of textile products. The bigger units in our cotton mill industry all over the place can do with a great deal more restriction than this restriction of 60%. Actually in these cases, if Government really go into the merit of the matter, and have wise and experienced and well-equipped advisers, as far as their cotton textile policy is concerned, they can go all over the place and perhaps set up different schedules of production, because unless you do that, you are bound to perpetrate something which we shall call injustice to those who are the weaker members of the cotton mill industry.

Most of the mills in West Bengal produce dhoties and saris, and most of them are uneconomic. We have a large number of uneconomic mills all over India. It seems the estimate varies from 34 to 150, but anyhow, there is a large number of mills which are not yet organised in such a fashion that they can deal with the problems of modern industrial production. The West Bengal mills

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

generally producing dhotis and saris would be very hard hit, and it will be almost impossible for most of them to be able to market their products, and at the same time make the kind of profit which they perhaps can legitimately expect. I have been told also—I am not very sure, but this is what I have been informed—that in the basic period which the Government of India have selected, viz. the period from March 1951 to April 1952, most of the Bengal mills produced more saris, as there was much demand for the saris at that time.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): On a point of information, Sir. May I mention to the hon. Member that no kind of a readjustment of the basic period will help any of these Bengal mills, excepting one mill?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I appreciate that. That means at least that Government contemplates some relaxation of the rigidity as far as the West Bengal mills are concerned. But I feel, Sir, that if these mills are going to function effectively and if they are going to produce at least as much as West Bengal needs today, then they should be treated with even greater consideration. I say so because in West Bengal only 265 million yards of cloth are produced and of that, very little is fit for export as it is mainly coarse and medium dhoties and sarees. Now the fixation of 60 per cent of the total production of dhoties and sarees will naturally push them into a terrible mess. Now, if the *per capita* allotment of 16 yards is borne in mind, West Bengal requires at least 40 crores of yards but West Bengal mills cannot at their best produce more than 26½ crore yards. And that is why cloth comes from outside West Bengal, which is not really the way to solve the crisis. So possibly if the case of West Bengal mills is considered with an eye to all the different factors of the situation, then I am sure a *via media* could be discovered.

In connection with this, I also want to point out another matter which was mentioned by the hon. Minister. He said that many of the West Bengal mills had misbehaved. Now, it is very likely—I hold no brief for the West Bengal mills—that they had misbehaved, but I do not think that there could be a generalised statement that there was universal misbehaviour.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No, Sir.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I say this because on the 14th September this year a question was asked in this House and the answer elicited was to the effect that some 45 mills had exceeded their dhoti production and prosecution had been ordered. But somehow, there was no prosecution by the State Government of West Bengal. Either therefore the West Bengal Government was in collusion with the mill interests or certain factors had been brought to the notice of the West Bengal Government as well as of the Central Government which indicated that a rigid application of whatever was the rule at that time was not warranted in this particular case.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is correct.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Taken the wind out of the sails.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is necessary, therefore, for us to remember that it is not by merely attempting to step up exports, it is not by merely attempting to safeguard the profits of the millowners that we are going to solve the crisis. As a matter of fact, our cotton mill industry is something of which the country is proud. Nearly 800,000 workers work in this industry, and this industry means not only that 800,000 people and their dependants are relying on what they get of their work, but also it means that the setting up of these cotton mills adds to the economic efficiency of our country. It creates certain sites where all kinds of other concomitant business operations have

to go on alongside a cotton mill, and therefore, the existence of this industry is to us very important. But I warn the Government that from time to time the employers are coming forward with all sorts of bogeys. I find, for example, about the cost of cotton which they are going to get from Egypt, that that depends very largely on what happens in Egypt—how sterling cotton is going to come to this country. It may be that that again would create another crisis. So this sort of dependence upon what is happening abroad should cease as soon as ever it is possible. I say also that much of the machinery in these cotton mills is now getting obsolete and perhaps one of these days the cotton millowners will come before us and say that Government has got to help. The Government has to take the entire situation into consideration and have a complete plan regarding the rehabilitation of the cotton mills industry with a view, not certainly to the profits of the millowners, but mainly to the needs of the consumers and also to the needs of the working class.

I see also, Sir, that the rates of the excise are almost punitive. Now there is restriction of production and there is a punitive excise. I am sure it does not really help. There is no price control. If there was price control, I could have understood at least some aspects of it, but in the absence of price control, this restriction of production and a punitive imposition of excise is, to my mind, something which is not acceptable.

Then again, I say that perhaps it will be better if this excise can be turned into a sort of cess which might be utilised for the purpose of assisting the handloom industry as well as the real needs of the cotton millowners when they are really warranted. If the money that is to come from this particular imposition is to be utilised for the genuine interests of our country, then surely we can welcome that kind of measure. As it is Sir, therefore, I find that the bigger

mills are not affected by this restriction, and it is the smaller mills which require to be assisted in the present context of things. They are badly affected; and I find the consumer is getting as raw a deal as he ever did. It is good that Mr. Gadgil reminded us of those days in 1948 when decontrol meant—and it had been openly stated in all the papers—that in three months' time the cotton mill magnates and middlemen netted 100 crores of rupees or some such figure. It is good, Sir, that you remember these things and, remembering these things, we have to fashion our policy. I repeat, Sir, however, that we have every sympathy with the handloom workers for whose interests we are prepared to go as far as it is possible to go. But we resent the illusion which is being sought to be created, that by merely restricting the production of mills you think the handloom workers would be ultimately benefited. On the contrary, we say that this is not going really to benefit the handloom worker substantially. This shows how necessary it is for Government to come forward with a really comprehensive scheme with an eye to the interest of the consumer, the worker in the cotton mill industry, the worker in the handloom industry as well as the legitimate interest and legitimate expectations of profit which the cotton millowner may have in the context of today.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakha-patnam): The hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry might as well congratulate himself on the very adroit manner in which he has evaded the issues in directing this debate on this very innocent-looking Bill. But it happens, Sir, that this Bill constitutes one of the three steps so far taken by the Government of India to assist primarily the cottage and handloom industries.

I regret to say that during the course of this debate since yesterday, the very purpose for which these steps have been taken has been almost forgotten by my hon. colleagues in this

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

House. Let us see, Sir, what exactly is the structural position of this Bill in relation to the previous steps taken. In the first place, there is that notification—No. T.C. 1052 of January putting a ceiling on the production of dhoties by mills up to 60 per cent. Now, this Bill, Sir, seeks to plug certain loopholes in that notification. Then, Sir, there is the Bill, the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development (Additional Excise Duty on Cloth) Bill which this hon. House passed in April this year. And now the present Bill, for an addition to the excise duty. In other words, one is to plug certain loopholes in an executive order and the other is to supplement the excise duty levied in April this year. I belong to that school of thought, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which believes that wherever there is any loophole in the law or the procedure available to Government, it has got to be plugged. But the fact remains that while introducing this Bill, my hon. friend, the Minister of Commerce and Industry, as I have said earlier, adroitly evaded the issues involved in the consideration of this Bill.

With your permission, Sir, I would like to quote from what he said on the last occasion when he was piloting the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development (Additional Excise Duty on Cloth) Bill in April this year. This is what he said:

"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. 2 crores, as a token for expenditure on khadi and handlooms, when

they accepted the Demands for Grants in respect of the Commerce and Industry Ministry. No portion of the money can be spent without parliamentary sanction, and the money that is spent will be under the control of the Auditor General".

Sir, the estimate given was that under this Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development (Additional Excise duty on Cloth) Act of April this year, as much as 6 crores of rupees would become available to the Government for distribution towards assistance to the khadi and handloom industries. My regret is that while introducing this Bill, my hon. friend, the Commerce and Industry Minister did not mention exactly what he estimates to get out of this additional excise duty.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It will depend upon the amount of misbehaviour.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Without having an estimate of the possible misbehaviour he has brought in this Bill. That is a small point. But the point I am trying to draw the attention of the House to is this. Enormous quantities of money are raised as a taxation measure, to quote the words of my hon. friend the Commerce and Industry Minister. How is this money being spent?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No portion of it, Sir, can be spent without parliamentary sanction. I underline those two words once again. If we spend it we will come before the House for a supplementary grant.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: I thank the hon. Minister for the enlightenment, Sir. But, what has happened since the Bill was passed, and the cess was imposed? Why is this cess being sought to be imposed under the present Bill? The point I am really worried about, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this. Admittedly—and there can be no two opinions about it—the

handloom industry is in the doldrums. Not today; the crisis has not come in today; it has been there for some years, as you yourself know, Sir, particularly in the South. It is within the memory of most of my hon. colleagues here that my hon. friend the Commerce Minister waged a battle royal with such a redoubtable politician and statesman like Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, who wanted 100 per cent. reservation of dhoties for the handloom industry last year.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Question.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Finally, one fine morning the hon. Commerce Minister capitulates. I am not grudging the capitulation, because I personally believe that something must be done, as he said yesterday some drastic thing some fundamental thing must be done to save the industry on which more than a crore of people are dependent these days. But the question still remains unanswered, Sir, since I find here the law, the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Act, came into force in April and 7 months have gone by. Has any money been collected? Can they say how that money is being spent? Is there still a balance of unspent money? How is the hon. Minister going to arrange for its expenditure to give succour and relief to the handloom and khadi industry in the first place, and also to rehabilitate portions of that sector of our national economy? Sir, an answer to these questions is of fundamental importance. Without an answer to these questions this House cannot agree to the passing of this Bill. I am convinced that nobody in this country seriously objects to the rehabilitation of the khadi and the handloom industry.

Now, let us examine a bit carefully the objects for which these enormous sums of money are sought to be raised as an impost upon one section of the industry in India. Clause 4 of the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development Act of April

this year contained the following objectives.

“Undertaking assistance to and encouraging the Khadi and other Handloom Industries.”

Sir, this House is entitled, while considering this Bill, to information from my hon. friend as to the manner in which this objective has been sought to be reached, during the last 7 months.

The other objective, Sir, ‘encouraging adoption of improved methods of manufacturing khadi and other handloom cloth and so on’. It goes on to specify actually seven objectives. I do not wish to waste the time of the House by reading them, because all of us have gone through this Bill earlier. But, I feel I should draw the attention of the House to these objectives. I want information as to the manner in which the Governments, both at the Centre and in the States, have assisted and enabled this industry to fulfil these objectives. Otherwise, there is no necessity for this Bill. In fact, the most laudable action would be a repeal of this Act which we passed in April even though I would regret that. I personally feel that everything must be done to strengthen the mechanism and the machinery of the Government for the proper utilisation of 6 crores of rupees, the money collected from April when the Act was passed, towards the assistance to the handloom and khadi industries.

Sir, here under clause 5 there are very interesting provisions made. The rule-making power is entrusted to the Government. For example, they have defined powers:

(a) ‘the proceeds of the duty of excise levied under this Act may be applied for all or any of the purposes specified in section 4.’

“(b) the making of grants or loans from such proceeds to State Governments for all or any of the said purposes;

[Dr. Lanka Sundaram]

- (c) the allocation of the net proceeds of the duty of excise between khadi and other handloom industries;
- (d) the manner in which accounts relating to the proceeds of the duty of excise shall be maintained; "

Sir, I demand, and I am sure every hon. colleague of mine in this House irrespective of party affiliations would demand, information as to the manner in which this vast sum of money is being spent or is being sought to be spent in the manner indicated.

Having said this, I will say that the whole object of my intervening in this debate is this. I have an interest in the good of the handloom industry which has a large stake in my part of the country, Andhra Desa. I am grateful to my hon. friend Prof. H. N. Mukerjee for having brought this matter before this House. Out of the 28 lakhs of handlooms in the country, my hon. friend the Commerce Minister said about 4 lakhs are non-commercial, and located in Assam. I do not have any personal knowledge of Assam, and I do not know the definition of non-commercial and commercial. I am persuaded that in Andhra Desa the industry, both the khadi and non-khadi sectors, of which we have got an enviable reputation in this country, there are not less than 350,000 handlooms. I am subject to correction, because I have not got the break-up which is difficult. I am talking with a great amount of caution. Anyway, the handloom industry is rather a well-equipped industry in India. From my own constituency, Sir, only last week some 3,000 handloom weavers started on what is called a hunger march. I have telegrams; I have memoranda, and I ought to have been present there, but for work in this House. These hunger marches have been going on as Prof. Mukerjee said earlier, since several months. In the Andhra area the handloom weavers are very hard hit;

in fact, gruel centres are sought to be organised for the relief of these people. There is acute economic distress in Andhra Desa. From the reports I have received it is so in other parts of the country also, in Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra also. (*Interruption*). I want here the answer to the question: the purpose for which the three steps were taken or sought to be taken by the Government, beginning with the executive action of January, then passing this Act of April this year and also the present Bill. Is it sought to be solved by the mere raising of finance? It would appear, Sir, that in the name of plugging loopholes in the executive powers they are only raising revenue, and nothing less and nothing more. I shall be grateful, and I shall be interested to know the manner in which it is really proposed to give relief to the people who are afflicted, and also to rehabilitate and re-organise the handloom and khadi industries in every part of the country, so that it will become a very important and self-sufficient sector of our national activity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is that all relevant for this Bill? This is only a preventive or punitive Bill not intended for raising taxation.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: That is the question I put, Sir. My implications are clear.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If anybody commits a breach, the object is to penalise him. It is intended to penalise the production of more than the 60 per cent. allowed.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: The point I was making is that this Bill is intended to plug certain loopholes, and so it must be taken in the context of that Act which we passed in April.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Are we going to hear the administrative difficulties of the previous legislation?

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Sir, if you refer to the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill, it is clear. It is

said, 'with a view to assisting the handloom industry'. So, this House is entitled to know in what way the Government was able to assist the industry by the previous cess. (*Interruption*). I was going to put a question to the hon. Minister about the employment implications of this Bill.

Sir, I quote a sentence from his speech on the last occasion, in regard to the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Bill, before this House. I am quoting from the proceedings of the 6th April. He said:

"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."

I should like to refer to this quotation for one reason, particularly the objective of the Government in relation to the executive order of January, the Bill of April and the present Bill, to rehabilitate and assist the handloom and khadi industry.

Now, this is the attitude with which they have approached this Bill. I have quoted this from the speech of the hon. Minister for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to the very serious implications of the unemployment problem and the problem of the khadi and handloom industry. I am sure the hon. Minister would give us as much information as is possible in the circumstances as to the manner in which these moneys are raised and how they are being spent and so on and so forth.

One other point and I resume my seat. Yesterday, when he spoke on the Bill, the hon. Minister referred to

certain statistics. He said that the peak production of dhoties in this country was about 50,000 bales a month. He also said that the demand internally is about 45,000 bales a month and with the ceiling of the production of dhoties under the executive order of January, at 30,000 bales a month. If it is so, deduct the 30,000 bales from the 45,000 bales, the balance would be 15,000 bales. That is what you call the possibility for the handloom and khadi industry to supplement mill production. When there is such a tremendous scope for the production of khadi and handloom cloth in India, how is it that even 7½ months after the passing of this Bill, the khadi and the handloom industry of our country is still in the doldrums. That is a question for which the House is entitled to get an answer. What is happening? I listened to one of my hon. colleagues a few minutes ago, Shri Gadgil, I think, who made a reference to a part of the handloom capacity being unemployed. The House is entitled to know the manner in which part of the industry is unemployed, and if that is so, whether they are not able to fill up the gap. This is really 50 per cent. of the total mill production of dhoties. I think a question of policy is involved here Sir.

In Andhra and other parts of the country, there is a very grave situation developing—I am not given to exaggerating matters—and this is going on for months together, and something must be done to give relief to the khadi and handloom weavers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Chettiar.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri (Gauhati): Should not dhoti-wearing people be given preference to speak, Sir?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am aware of this. Actually I am calling one in four "dhoti people".

At 5 o'clock I intend calling upon the Minister to reply. I would therefore request hon. Members to restrict their remarks to ten minutes each.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur): The whole objective of this Bill is to give employment for nearly one crore of handloom weavers in India. The House will know, Sir, that a claim was made that all dhoties and saris must be reserved for them but the Government of India did not find its way to accept it. From the figures that the hon. Minister gave to the House, I am unable to see as to how far this reservation had helped the handloom weavers. To my knowledge—I was here when he delivered his speech—no account was given as to the extent they have really benefited by this reservation. Today the position does not seem to be any better than it was before reservation. We were told that the reservation to this extent will go to help the employment of weavers, but in Madras, which is a place where a large number of weavers live, in Andhra area and in almost every place where they are in large numbers, we find that their stocks are piled up and don't move. I would have wished that the Government of India should have gone into the reasons for these stocks not having been moved rather than bring bills like this on such tentative presumptions. A duty has been levied; an Act has been passed by which we will get nearly Rs. 6 crores, but the way of giving employment to these weavers is not yet known or found. Absence of an effective market is the main thing. This can be done either by way of reservation or by helping the industry to become more competitive. The extent to which we have reserved, that is, 40 per cent. of dhoties has not considerably helped the handloom weavers, and now the proposal is to allow the mills to produce more, if necessary, on payment of something like a punitive tax. The production of such cloth is bound to weigh heavily in the market and to that extent is bound to be competitive against the handloom weavers. To my mind, it seems that this proposal, by its very nature, defeats the objective with which the original action was taken.

So, Sir, to this Bill, as far as I see, there is opposition from the handloom weavers themselves because this may affect them prejudicially by the mills putting into market production more than 60 per cent. again, when a mill goes into working, the larger the production the lower the cost. This duty, in the case of certain efficient mills, will not bother them at all. I am not sure whether this Bill is to help the mills or the handloom weavers. We have also heard complaints from the side of the mills, and I am not able to see for whose benefit this Bill has been brought forward. In this matter, I think we must come to certain conclusions ideologically. The Government of India, in their Five Year Plan, have said that as far as the handloom industry is concerned—we should support it especially because it is a humane problem seeking to give employment to a crore of people. If we want to do it let us do it efficiently. The way in which we are trying to tackle this problem is half-hearted and ineffective. It helps neither the mills nor the handloom weavers. I am sure that the way in which this problem should be tackled is to secure a market for the handloom weavers' products—whether it be dhoties, whether it be saris or anything else. The suggestion was made by Shri H. N. Mukerjee "Let the State purchase all the goods of the handloom weavers". If that is possible, I shall be very happy. I think that in spite of this reservation, it has not done much good to the handloom weavers. Let us decide once and for all—the House and the Government—whether we want the handloom weavers to live or we want to make them die. What is happening now is that many of the handloom weavers are dying of starvation. We know how much they are suffering and have suffered. Previously they did not get yarn and today they are not able to sell their goods. They are suffering a great deal either way. I think this half-hearted way of deal-

ing with the problem is not good and does not solve the problem at all. To my mind, this Bill will in no way help the handloom weavers but in some respects it will make its competitors stronger.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am trying to distribute the time to some people in favour of mills and to some others in favour of handlooms. I have heard many in favour of handloom weavers. **Shri R. K. Chaudhuri.**

4 P.M.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity of speaking on this Bill, because I am one of the very few persons who habitually use dhoti. One of the reasons, I think, which has brought about the slump in the trade of weavers' merchandise in South India is due to the example which the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry has shown by discarding his dhoti altogether. So far as my own State is concerned, we have nothing like slump in trade. But so far as handloom dhoties are concerned, we are rather suffering from failure to supply this demand which is already there, and this failure is due to the fact that in our State sufficient yarn is not available. My friend, Mr. Lanka Sundaram, was speaking about 3,50,000 looms in Andhra State. I think it will be a surprise for this House to learn that in our State, Assam, there are not less than 40 lakhs of handlooms, or even more. At least in every household, nearly, there is a loom. Taking a very modest view, at least there should be 40 lakhs of handlooms there, and most of them are lying idle for want of yarn, because the mill yarn will not be supplied and secondly, although we in Assam are very much in favour of having a spinning mill, the Government has not granted us that facility at all. A spinning mill was started in Gauripur in Assam and some spindles were supplied, but afterwards that supply was withdrawn, because the company could

not furnish the necessary funds within the time stipulated by the Government. This is the way in which the handloom industry is being encouraged by the Government. So far as the object of this Bill is concerned, that it is with a view to help the handloom industry that this Bill is coming forward, I might say without hesitation that this is only a naked mockery. It is nothing but a naked mockery. If you really wish to help the handloom industry you ought to make sufficient quantity of yarn available to it and at a cheap rate. The Government may incur a little loss in the beginning by sacrificing a little of their revenue and by making the yarn available to the handloom weavers at a much cheaper rate. It is only through that means that the handloom weavers can compete with the millowners. Otherwise, it is very difficult for them to compete with the millowners.

What will be the effect of this Bill? The effect of this Bill would be either to benefit the millowners or to benefit the consumers. Consumers naturally prefer, excepting in Bengal and Assam, mill-made cloth. In Bengal and Assam, on all sacred occasions too, we prefer to have the handloom dhoties and sarees. Therefore, Sir, if really it is intended to encourage the handloom industry, the States of West Bengal and Assam would be prepared to take a sufficient supply of these dhoties and sarees from South India, if it is possible to get them. At the same time we want that we should be given a sufficient quantity of yarn so that we can produce our handloom cloth also.

Now, Sir, I do not know what is really meant by this "Dhoties (Additional Excise Duty) Bill". It is stated in the definition: " 'Dhoti' is dhoti which is generally known by that name." In Assam, Bengal and Orissa, we have a different nomenclature for dhoti and saree worn by males and females respectively. Those which are worn by females,

[Shri R. K. Chaudhuri]

we call them sarees and those which are worn by males, we call them dhoties. So, I do not know whether the object of this Bill is entirely to exclude sarees. Here, in this part of the country, I know they have two kinds of dhoties. One is called 'mardana' dhoti and the other is called—that is for females—'zenana' dhoti. We know the word 'saree' is unknown here, so to say, except in the sense of silk saree. (*Interruptions*). But they are called 'mardana' dhoties in Delhi.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You need not worry. The confusion is only in Delhi.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: I do not know very much what sarees they put on here, but in our country our people do not put on sarees but they put on 'mekhla' which is something of a scarf. The womenfolk in our State do not put on sarees but only 'mekhla.' You, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, are quite right in asking me not to worry about them, because in these days, one ought to be a little parochial.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are others to take care of that!

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: Another thing, Sir, is that the dhoties are only those which have got a coloured border. That is the definition which is given. Now, a large majority of widows put on uncoloured border sarees or 'sada' sarees. In our country, both in Bengal and Assam, only those who have lost their parents can put on uncoloured border sarees. Otherwise, they have to put on the ordinary border sarees. I think that I need not worry again about it, so far as women are concerned, because now they have taken to put on borderless sarees. They do not care whether you call them widows or as persons who have husbands. They put on borderless jackets, borderless silk and everything. There is no need to worry about that also, but the main point about which I am worried is that

the Government, in order to be clear in their object to help the consumers (as well as the handloom weavers, ought to make yarn available at a cheaper rate for a certain number of years. Now, for the purchase of khadi in Delhi, there is a concession of three annas in the rupee, that concession is in Delhi alone and not in other parts of India. And that three annas concession is not given to those silk cloths like Indian 'mooga', because that is paid by the Government. So, if the Government also is prepared to risk some money in the interests of handloom weavers they should first of all suffer some loss in the beginning and make the yarn available to the weavers at a much cheaper rate so that they can compete with the mill cloth. Secondly, they ought to give a concession to the purchasers at three annas in the rupee, and a little more than that to those purchasers of handloom cloth.

Acharya Kripalani (Bhagalpur cum Purnea): We supply 'yarn' free here.

Dr. N. B. Khare: At Rs. 40 per day—not free.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: In that case, I request the hon. Member to give some yarn free to Assam and they can use it there, because, as I said, there is a loom in every household in Assam. And those looms are lying idle for want of yarn. We do not worry about markets. We get sufficient markets there for our handloom cloth, because people generally prefer to put on handloom cloth there. Towels which are mill-made are unknown in our part of the country. They use 'kamchas', dhoties and all other cloths made by handloom. The only difficulty is, of course, that—and that is natural—silk yields more income. Generally the weavers are all women. Mother, daughter and sister—all do the work. They weave the cloth. The loom is never idle in that way. Sometimes the mother sits on the loom, sometimes the

daughter and sometimes the daughter-in-law. The loom is kept busy but now it is silent. There is no yarn. So, the problem, if it has got to be solved in the interests of the weavers and in the interests of the consumers, would be by helping the Government or the people there, to start a spinning mill so that they can supply yarn at a much less rate than here.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Sir, up till now, men in authority and power were telling our people: 'Produce or perish.' Now, we are going to tell them: 'If you produce more, you shall perish.' Really this Parliament is going to tell the mill industry of India that if you produce more, you will have to pay a penalty. This is a punitive measure. If the Government is sincerely anxious to help the handloom industry, all sections of the House, irrespective of party affiliations, would stand by the Government and help them.

Sir, I come from Bengal and I can tell my hon. colleagues in this House that there are thousands of people who have migrated from East Bengal—poor refugees—who kept up the magnificent handloom industry in Dacca and also in Mymensing and in Nokhali and in parts of Tippera, and who are doing fine work. Thousands were engaged in this work, but a number of them have died. It is a very tragic story. Our Government could not or did not do much, and without resources they died neglected. I went to some of these handloom weavers' colonies in the district of Nadia and those colonies were in a very bad state. They are the people who used to manufacture, and their forefathers used to manufacture the splendid muslins of Dacca and the famous Tangail sarees. Those people are now sitting idle and their looms were not working. Not ten or twenty but hundreds of them were idle. Sir, the only thing that I want to point out to the hon. Minister is this: This Bill is not merely a clumsy device, it is a totally ineffective device which you have brought forward for ameliorating the handloom industry.

Now, look at this Bill. I have never seen such a wonderful measure as this. Definition:

"(a) 'dhoti' means any type of grey or bleached cloth of plain wave which—

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

If you omit only coloured yarn on the border you get out of this. Therefore, by little device you can make this penal provision thoroughly ineffective.

Secondly, Sir, this Parliament enacted the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development (Additional Excise Duty on Cloth) Act, (Act No. XII) of 1953, the other day. We would like to know how much has been collected and what has been done. Obviously there had been some mills which were not co-operating. The hon. Minister told us, and we were very sorry to know that, that some mills in West Bengal misbehaved. I am further assured by the hon. Minister that really the so-called mis-behaviour was not on a large or wide scale; only one mill did something improper and there was no prosecution or anything of the kind. I am glad to know of it.

Sir, if the intention really is to assist the handloom industry, will this kind of measure at all be helpful or effective? Is it right on principle, Sir, to render assistance to only one section, or one section of the industry at the expense of the other sector which is better organised, which is more efficient? It is right on principle? Is it consistent with sound economic principle to do that?

[Shri N. C. Chatterjee]

Sir, look at the burden that we are imposing on the mill industry. You are trying to alleviate unemployment in the handloom industry. But are you not going to create unemployment in the mill industry? What will happen? If you compel the mills to produce only up to 60 per cent. of their previous year's production what will happen is that they will close down some of their shifts; some mills will perhaps be closed down. What will happen? There is bound to be unemployment. In one portion of the same industry you will create unemployment for the purpose of reducing unemployment in the other sector.

Look at the benefits to be secured by the handloom industry. Will it be really something appreciable, something which would place them on their feet? I have always thought that this kind of palliatives, this kind of clumsy device, as the hon. Minister himself has said.....

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I said you might call it: I did not say it is a clumsy device.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It is certainly a crude and clumsy device; it is a very ineffective device. Really, if you want to help the handloom industry you ought to take a long range view of things.

Your own Planning Commission in their report have put forward certain methods whereby the cottage industries can be put on their feet. First of all there should be some regulated system of State purchase. Secondly co-operative organisations should come forward; the co-operative system should not be confined merely to stimulating only rural credit. That should be organised properly for the purpose of helping cottage industries. You cannot have a proper co-operative system of organisation unless and until there is Governmental guarantee of financial assistance. Government should do it. That is the first thing to be done.

Therefore, I am appealing to the Government that co-operative societies should not be confined merely to the old habit of supplying rural credit. The successful working of the co-operative system would depend on the resources, financial resources; and there must be governmental guarantee or big banks' guarantee.

Secondly there should be efficient organisation of the workers in this industry. This industry, or this part of the industry is thoroughly unorganised; Government should do it.

Thirdly, the State should play its part in the revival of cottage industries, specially in this sector. But they have done nothing. They themselves have said that they can do it in many ways. They can do it by the supply of raw materials; coordination of training and research; setting up of emporia. They can introduce the system of compulsory purchase. Those things ought to be done. It will not do for them to say that the mills should not produce beyond a particular quota. The taxation envisaged by this measure is very heavy; it ranges from 2 annas to 8 annas.

The Bombay Economic Enquiry Committee made six suggestions for the revival of the handloom industry: (1) raw materials (2) technique of manufacture (3) finance (4) marketing (5) taxation and (6) solution of the other difficulties. You know, Sir, what the mill industry contributes today by way of taxation, State, Central and local. They are paying over Rs. 40 crores annually. Don't kill that industry which is laying golden eggs. You should not cripple it. If you cripple it you will be doing no service to the country.

If your idea is to help the handloom industry what are you going to do for improving the technique of manufacture, to improve the marketing of their goods? What are you going to do for giving them adequate finance? How are you going to ensure that they get the raw materials? When

I used to go to Assam in my younger days, as my hon. friend Shri Rohini Kumar Chaudhuri said, I could hear the music of the handlooms working, because every household there had a handloom. There will not be a family without a loom. But that music has now stopped, mainly because raw materials are not available. The hon. Minister says that yarn is available in plenty; possibly there is faulty distribution; possibly there is no proper organisation to look to the distribution. So, it is the lack of finance, lack of organisation, lack of marketing facilities, these are the factors which are crippling the handloom industry. Merely penalising manufacture by the mills will not help. This kind of negative approach won't do. I am pleading for a more positive, more constructive, more helpful approach, which will lead to the lasting good of the handloom industry and that will lead to the revival of this cottage industry.

The Bombay Enquiry Committee reported that most of the handloom weavers, the artisans, are in the grip of moneylenders. They have got to pay heavy interest due to want of banking facilities. What steps are you going to take? Is there any stores purchase policy under contemplation? Is the Government thinking of starting emporia? Are you going to purchase handloom cloth and display it properly; are you going to stimulate the sale of our handloom products in foreign markets? What are the Textile Commissioners and our well paid ambassadors and staff doing? Are they advising the handloom weavers to develop a particular type of design, artistic design, which will have a foreign market? Is there any coordination in that direction? Therefore, I am saying that you should create these factors which will remove the real handicap in the way. Mere punitive approach, mere penal provisions for the purpose of penalising more production by the mills will not do. It will only hurt the ordinary consumer; it will hurt the poor people. Therefore I am pleading for setting up a regular organisation—

what you yourself recommended in the Planning Commission's Report—supply of raw materials, co-ordination, research and training and not merely reservation of spheres of production, not merely the imposition of a cess. I am pleading for a more constructive approach, a more helpful approach. And that will be the real approach to the problem.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह (जिला गोरखपुर—दक्षिण): उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह बिल जब से इस हाउस में आया है तब से सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने बिल के इस रूप का विरोध किया है, केवल श्री एन० सी० चटर्जी साहेब ने विरोध करते हुए मिल मालिकों के पक्ष में कुछ कहा है।

इस बिल में मैं आप की तबज्जह दो बातों की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

गवर्नमेंट के आदेश से जनवरी, सन् ५३ में मिलों को आदेश हुआ कि साठ परसेंट से अधिक धोती न बनावें, लेकिन उन के लिये जो परमिसिबल मार्जिन रक्खा गया है उस के अन्दर लिखा गया है :

"one-fourth of sixty per cent of the total quantity of dhoties packed by that mill during the relevant period."

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस से क्या यह समझा जाये कि साठ परसेंट से ऊपर एक क्वार्टर, क्या इस प्रकार से उन को ७५ फीसदी की छट दी जा रही है? साठ परसेंट की तो आलरेडी उन को छट मिल चुकी है। साठ परसेंट की छट मिलमालिकों को जनवरी १९५३ के आदेशानुसार मिल चुकी है। उस के बाद परमिसिबल कोटा उस साठ परसेंट का पच्चीस परसेंट किया जा रहा है। तो क्या यह समझा जायगा कि यह परमिसिबल कोटा साठ परसेंट था वह नहीं रहा और उस के अन्दर केवल अत्र पन्द्रह परसेंट ही रहेगा, या यह साठ परसेंट में पन्द्रह परसेंट और कोटे में जायगा और इस तरह से यह ७५ फी सदी हो जाता है और इस कानून के

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

पास हो जाने से ७५ फी सदी फ्री हो जाने के बाद केवल पच्चीस परसेंट पर यह टैक्स लगने जा रहा है ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि ग्रानरेबुल मिनिस्टर इस चीज को साफ करें ।

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, if the hon. Member wants a reply he must make himself understood so far as I am concerned. Otherwise I won't be able to answer.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I was saying that 60 per cent. was exempted by the order in January 1953. Clause 3 of this Bill says that one-fourth of 60 per cent. will be deemed to be the permissible quota.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): For the quarter.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: For every quarter. I want clarification whether 60 per cent. will be also exempted.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The original order stands. Only, in order to evaluate production we are not taking the month but the quarter because in one month the production may be more and in another month it may be less. The overall position will be taken for the assessment; for the purpose of the penal levy it will be a quarter, not a month.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: The whole principle of the Bill is to give protection to cottage industries. We have to consider the question whether by these measures we are giving any protection to the cottage industry. From the speeches that have been delivered everybody is agreed that by these measures there is not going to be any protection to the cottage industry. If you are not giving any protection to the cottage industry by this, you must necessarily evolve some other method by which protection can be given to the cottage industry.

The real problem is unemployment and to remove unemployment my friend Mr. Chatterjee argued that we have been asking: produce or perish. But today it is produce and perish.

Shri Gadgil: And punish!

Shri Sinhasan Singh: And punish. We want to produce more and employ more persons. By producing through mills we are employing less and producing more. In our country which has a population of 36 crores and where a large number of people depend on handloom for their living, we should produce more through handlooms, thereby employing more men, giving protection to more men and also producing more. So we want to produce more through more men, and not with less men through the mills. That is the difference.

In this connection I would like to say that we have to finally decide whether we are going to have a mixed economy for all time to come or whether we are going to give the go-by to mixed economy and go the Gandhian and socialist way and not the capitalist way. Mixed economy is taking us nowhere. I would like here to read a few lines of what Mahatma Gandhi said about the khadi industry and about the handloom industry and the mill industry. These were his remarks in the course of his Prayer Speeches, on 6th November 1947, six years ago.

“हिन्दुस्तान में ४० करोड़ लोग रहते हैं। अगर पाकिस्तान का हिस्सा उस से अलग कर दिया जाये, तो भी उस में ३० करोड़ से ऊपर लोग बचेंगे। उन की जरूरत की सारी कपास देश में पैदा होती है। उन की कपास को बुनने लायक सूत में बदलने के लिये देश में काफी कालने वाले मौजूद हैं। और उन के हाथ कते सूत को बुनने के लिये हिन्दुस्तान में जरूरत से ज्यादा जुलाहे भी हैं। बहुत बड़ी पूंजी लगाये बिना भी हम देश में अपनी जरूरत के चरखे, करघे और दूसरा जरूरी सामान आसानी से बना सकते हैं। इसलिये जरूरत सिर्फ इस बात की है कि हम अपने आप में पक्का विश्वास रखें और खादी के सिवा दूसरा कोई कपड़ा न इस्तेमाल करने का इरादा कर लें। आप

जानते हैं कि देश में महीन से महीन खादी तैयार की जा सकती है और मिलों से भी ज्यादा अच्छे डिजाइन बनाये जा सकते हैं। अब चूंकि हिन्दुस्तान विदेशी जुए से आजाद हो गया है इसलिये खादी का ऐसा विरोध नहीं हो सकता, जैसा कि विदेशी शासकों के नुमाइन्दे किया करते थे। इसलिये मुझे यह देख कर सब से ज्यादा ताज्जुब होता है कि जब हम अपनी मरजी का काम करने के लिये पूरी तरह आजाद हैं, तब न तो कोई खादी के बारे में चर्चा करते हैं, न खादी की संभावनाओं में श्रद्धा रखते हैं। और, हम हिन्दुस्तान को कपड़ा पुराने के लिये मिल के कपड़े के सिवा दूसरी बात ही नहीं सोच सकते। इसलिये मुझे रती भर शक नहीं कि खादी का अर्थ-शास्त्र ही हिन्दुस्तान का सच्चा और फायदेमन्द अर्थ-शास्त्र हो सकता है।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (शोलापुर—
—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ): यह महात्मा गांधी का प्रवचन कब का है ?

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : यह ६ नवम्बर
सन् १९४७ का है।

Every time we have taken the name of Mahatma Gandhi. But the philosophy on our economy life that he wanted to put before us, we have totally ignored.

Here, the handloom industry can be protected only by giving reasonable sphere of production or, as Shri Gadgil pointed out, by purchasing their goods. Mahatma Gandhi also said that we should draw a dividing line as regards the count of yarn for handloom production, namely 25 counts. Unless you divide the margin—this much for the mill and this much for handloom—you cannot really see that both go by competition.

Even if you have this duty, what will be the effect? There will be some rise in the prices of mill-made cloth. But handloom cloth cannot compete with it because mill-made cloth will be finer in design and

more durable. If the purchaser finds the two side by side, naturally he will purchase the mill cloth and not the handloom cloth.

My friend was suggesting emporiums. Emporiums will not make people purchase. There must be cheapness or some compulsory factor. Shri Rajagopalachari said that dhoti and saree must be produced only by handloom. You must divide the sphere of the two, and mills should be debarred from producing dhoties and sarees. They should be produced only by handlooms. Unless you take that step, I think any amount of duty will only burden the consumer and the burden on the consumers will only recoil on us and we will be nowhere. If we really want to help the people and give more employment to the people, we must divide the spheres of the handloom and the mill.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Jhunjhunwala.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): We have had no chance, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: From Andhra?

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): Madhya Bharat had no chance in this session and in the last session.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought that Shri Sinhasan Singh came from Madhya Bharat.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: From Maharashtra also.

Shri M. D. Ramasami: rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A few minutes each.

श्री झुनझुनवाला (भागलपुर मध्य) : उपवाचस्पति जी, यह बिल बहुत छोटा है परन्तु यदि इस को सूक्ष्म दृष्टि से देखा जाय तो बड़े ही महत्व का है। आप ने कहा है कि यह बिल छोटा सा है, इस पर लोग इतना समय क्यों ले लेते हैं? इस में तो केवल यही छोटी सी बात है कि मिल वालों ने अतिनी

[श्री झुनझुनवाला]

धोतियां उन को बनाने के लिये कहा गया था, उस से बेशी प्रोड्यूस किया। उस के ऊपर सरकार चाहती है कि उन को सजा दी जाये, रेट से बेशी उन के ऊपर टैक्स लगा कर सजा देना चाहती है।

पहले तो मैं यह कहूंगा कि यह बिल जिस प्रकार से लाया गया है उस से यह सजा मिल मालिकों को कैसे होती है, यह तो आखिर कंज्यूमर्स लोगों पर ही होगी। इस बिल में कहीं पर भी यह जिक्र नहीं किया गया है कि यह जो ८ आ०, ४ आ० या ३ आ० बेशी एकमाइज ड्यूटी लगाई जायेगी तो उस के ऊपर प्राइस कंट्रोल रहेगा, अर्थात् कंज्यूमर लोगों के पास जब वह माल जायेगा तो इतने रेट में बिकेगा और यह जो ड्यूटी लगाई गई है वह जो मिल मालिक हैं वह माल के ऊपर नहीं लगा सकेंगे। अगर ऐसा होता तब तो यह बात समझ में आ सकती थी, परन्तु सरकार की यह सजा हमारे मिल मालिकों के ऊपर नहीं, कंज्यूमर्स के ऊपर है। अतएव मैं अपने कामर्स तथा इंडस्ट्री के मिनिस्टर साहब से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि चूंकि आप कंज्यूमर्स की ज्वायस और टेस्ट का ध्यान रखते हैं, उन के ऊपर आप बहुत कृपा रखते हैं, तो इस बिल में कम से कम कोई ऐसा प्राविजन रख दीजिये कि यदि आप यह टैक्स मिल मालिकों से लें तो जिस माल के ऊपर यह टैक्स लगेगा वह माल जब बाजार में बिके तो मिल मालिक लोग यह टैक्स उस के दाम में जोड़ न सकें।

इस बिल से दूसरी बात यह होगी कि जब आप थोड़े से माल के ऊपर यह टैक्स लगा देंगे तो और जो माल बाजार में जायेगा उस में भी तेजी आजायेगी। नतीजा यह होगा कि इस बिल का उद्देश्य, जो कि हमारे कामर्स और इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्टर ने सोचा था कि

यह बिल मिलमालिकों को पेनलाइज करेगा वह पूरा नहीं होगा। इस से तो कंज्यूमर लोग पेनलाइज होंगे। इसलिये आप से मेरी यह प्रार्थना है कि आप इस में कोई ऐसा क्लॉज जोड़ दें, या

श्री बंसल : प्राडिनेन्स ?

श्री झुनझुनवाला : क्लॉज जोड़ दें कि जो इस टैक्स का पैसा आपके वह किसी तरह से कंज्यूमर्स के ऊपर न पड़े। यह मेरा पहला सुझाव है।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता था वह यह है कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब जब खादी और हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्रीज बिल लाये थे, उस में उन्होंने जो एकमाइज ड्यूटी हर एक मिल के कपड़े पर लगाई थी, उस से हम लोगों को यह आशा हुई थी तथा गांव वालों को भी यह आशा हुई थी कि अब जो खादी बनाने वाले हैं, हैंडलूम वाले हैं उन को इस प्रकार कोई सहायता मिलेगी, जिस से कि उन का रोजगार चल सकेगा। परन्तु उस से अब तक क्या हुआ और क्या नहीं हुआ यह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है। जब डा० लंका सुन्दरम ने पूछा तो हमारे कामर्स मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि जब वह खर्च किया जायगा तो वह हमारे सामने आवेंगे और यह रक्खेंगे कि उन्होंने ने इस ड्यूटी से इतना रुपया लिया है और इतना रुपया अब वह खर्च कर सकते हैं और हम उन को बतलायें कि उस को किस काम में लगाया जाय। यह ठीक है कि पार्लियामेंट सावरेन बाडी है, पार्लियामेंट से इजाजत लेनी चाहिये और पार्लियामेंट से पूछ कर काम करना चाहिये। परन्तु आज अप्रैल से ले कर नवम्बर तक लगभग खत्म हो चुका है, दूसरी अप्रैल भी आने वाली है, वह ६ करोड़ रुपया आप ने ले कर अपने पास रख लिया। आप कब

स्कीम बनावेंगे और कब पार्लियामेंट के सामने रखेंगे और कब हम सब लोगों से पूछेंगे कि किस काम में उसे लगाया जाय ? क्या हमारा यही उद्देश्य था ? क्या हमारी सरकार की यही नीति है कि केवल ऊपर की बनावटी बात करें कि हां, हम यह करना चाहते हैं, खादी को मदद करना चाहते हैं और हैंडलूम को मदद करना चाहते हैं परन्तु असलियत में वह कुछ नहीं करते हैं ? जो हमारे श्री कृष्णमाचारी जी हैं उनमें कम से कम मैं यह बहुत भारी गुण देखता हूँ कि वे ऐसा नहीं करते कि भीतर कुछ बात रखते हों और बाहर से दूसरी बात कहते हों। जो बात होती है उस को से साफ साफ कह देते हैं। जिस समय अनएम्प्लायमेंट का सवाल आया उन्होंने ने कह दिया कि यह सवाल बहुत बड़ा है, टेढ़ा है, उस को दूर करने के लिये यह जो छोटे छोटे मेजर्स हैं इन से कुछ होने वाला नहीं है, और यदि आप उससे यह चाहें कि बहुत कुछ हो जाय तो ऐसा होने वाला नहीं है इस में पच्चीसों वर्ष लगेंगे तब जा कर यह ठीक होगा। ठीक है, उन का कहना सही है, उन्होंने ने बहुत साफ कह दिया। परन्तु अब मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप हैंडलूम और खादी की इंडस्ट्री को किसी भी तरह से सहायता देना चाहते हैं या उन्हें पच्चीस साल ठहरना होगा। या केवल इस प्रकार का बिल ला कर के लोगों को भुलावा दे कर रखना चाहते हैं।

जब कभी खादी और हैंडलूम के प्रोटेक्शन के सम्बन्ध में या अन्य जो गांव की इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, गांव के व्यवसाय हैं उन के सम्बन्ध में बातें की जाती ह तो दो बातें सामने रखी जाती हैं। एक तो यह रक्खा जाता है कि साहब, उस का दाम बहुत तेज है, दूसरे यह रक्खा जाता है कि कंज्यूमर्स की च्वायस और उन की डिमान्ड को हम को मीट करना है, जिस से कि

उन को सजा न मिले ऐसा काम करना है।

दूसरी बात कल मैं ने यह सुनी कि हमें एक व्यापार को दूसरे व्यापार के ऊपर पैरासाइट नहीं बनाना चाहिये और जो काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उन को पैरासाइट बना कर मिल इंडस्ट्री को खत्म कर दें तो यह कुछ ठीक नहीं है। मैं जानता हूँ कि हां, ऐसा होता है, परन्तु आप लोग जरा कृपा कर के गम्भीरता से विचार कीजिये कि क्या मिल इंडस्ट्री हमारे गांव की इंडस्ट्री पर पैरासाइट नहीं हुई है ? आप आज गांव में जा कर देखिये कि वहां पर जो पुरानी चीजें बनती थीं, वह कहीं पर आज मालूम नहीं होती हैं, सब लोग आज मिल वालों की चीजों पर भरोसा कर के बैठ गये हैं, जो कुछ भी गांव की इंडस्ट्री थी मिल की चीजों को देख देख कर सब खत्म हो गई। आज कहीं भी थोड़ा सा अनएम्प्लायमेंट होता है, एक जगह अगर एक हजार कुली बर्खास्त कर दिये जाते हैं, मिल इंडस्ट्री में, तो यहां पर ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन आ जाता है और कहा जाता है कि एक हजार आदमियों का अनएम्प्लायमेंट हो गया है। परन्तु मैं यह कहता हूँ कि जहां करोड़ों लोगों का अनएम्प्लायमेंट बरसों से फैला हुआ है क्या आप लोग कभी उस पर भी विचार करते हैं ? क्या गवर्नमेंट इस के ऊपर विचार करती है ? क्या गवर्नमेंट इस के ऊपर विचार करेगी ? यह लोग बेचारे बोल नहीं सकते हैं, वे लोग आ कर आप के सामने हल्ला नहीं कर सकते हैं, इसलिये क्या आप लोग चुप बैठें रहेंगे और उन के दुःख को नहीं देखेंगे ? महात्मा गांधी ने क्या किया था ? वे आकर कैं आवाज उठाते थे। उन्होंने ने केवल यह कहा कि हमारे देश के लोग डम्ब हैं, बेचारे बोल नहीं सकते हैं। जो कुछ उन की दिक्कतें थीं उन को वह इस प्रकार रखते थे क्योंकि वे आवाज नहीं उठा सकते हैं।

[श्री मुनमु वाला]

मैं उन की आवाज आप लोगों के सामने रखता हूँ, और सारे हिन्दुस्तान को उन्होंने ने जगा दिया और उन्होंने ने एक रास्ता भी आप को बतलाया कि इस रास्ते को आप ग्रहण कीजिये, इस रास्ते से जो यहाँ की अनएम्प्लाय-मेंट है उस को आप दूर कर सकते हैं। अभी अनएम्प्लायमेंट के बारे में बहुत सी बहस हुई। यहाँ पर भी बहस हुई और लोगों ने घर में बैठ बैठ कर भी बहस की, लेकिन कोई ऐसी बात नहीं निकाली गई कि जो हमारे गांवों में क्रानिक अनएम्प्लायमेंट है उस में जरा सा भी सुधार होता। उस के बारे में मैं ने कहीं भी चर्चा नहीं सुनी। अतएव मैं इस बिल के ऊपर बोलते हुए इतना ही कहूंगा कि यदि आप सचमुच हैंडलूम और खादी इंडस्ट्री को मदद करना चाहते हैं और यह चाहते हैं कि वे बढ़ें और गांवों के लोगों को कुछ रोजगार मिले, तो आप सच्चे दिल से आइये। इस प्रकार की टुकड़े टुकड़े में बातें करके आप उन को लाभ नहीं पहुंचा सकते।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय वास्तव में इस विषय का उद्देश्य क्या है . . .

Shri Kanavade Patil (Ahmednagar North): Sir, I would like to speak. In my own constituency, there are about 40,000 handloom weavers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Which is the State where there are no handlooms?

Shri Kanavade Patil: There are 40,000 weavers in my own constituency.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: He is taking unnecessarily my time.

मैं इस बिल के उद्देश्य को ठीक प्रकार से समझने में असमर्थ हूँ। इस में यह बतलाया गया है कि जो कुछ मिलों ने कानून की अवहेलना कर के धोती का अधिक उत्पादन किया है उस पर शैक रखने के लिये यह कानून लाया जा रहा है।

आप ने अभी बतलाया था कि यह पीनेलाईजिंग ऐक्ट है। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि यह पीनेलाईजिंग ऐक्ट नहीं है बल्कि मिसबिहेवियर को लीगे-लाइज करने का ऐक्ट है। धोतियों का उत्पादन इस पर निर्भर नहीं है कि आप कितना टैक्स लगाते हैं; बल्कि वह तो इस पर निर्भर है कि उस की कितनी खपत है। अगर देश में उस की मांग है तो लोग उस को खरीदेंगे और मिल मालिक उस का उत्पादन कम नहीं करेंगे; मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि मेरे राज्य मध्य भारत में गाढ़ा आदि मोटा कपड़ा तो हैंडलूम से बनता है लेकिन धोतियां हैंडलूम से नहीं बनती हैं और किसान और गरीब जनता को मोटी धोती की आवश्यकता होती है। मध्य भारत में ज्यादातर धोती पहनने का रिवाज है। वहाँ कोई पाजामा या फ्राक नहीं पहनता। तो यह तो धोती पहनने वालों पर टैक्स लगाया गया है। अगर मनुष्य अपनी पसन्द बदल दें और पाजामा और फ्राक पहनने लगे तो वह इस टैक्स से बच जायेंगे लेकिन धोती पहनने वालों को तो यह टैक्स देना ही पड़ेगा। तो मेरा आप से यह निवेदन है कि जब तक मध्य भारत में हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को प्रोत्साहन दे कर, वहाँ के लोगों को यह काम सिखा कर और उन के ऐसोसियेशन बना कर और उत्पादन बढ़ा कर इतनी धोतियां नहीं पैदा की जाती कि वहाँ की मांग पूरी हो सके तब तक वहाँ के लोगों को एक कठिनाई का सामना करना होगा। तो इस से कोई चैक तो नहीं हुआ। यह स्टेप इफैक्टिव तो तब होता जब कि आप उन को कड़ी से कड़ी सजा देते। उन को इस तरह से इजाजत देने से तो कोई रोक हो ही नहीं सकती। इस लिये जो इस बिल का उद्देश्य है वह इस कानून से पूरा नहीं होने वाला है। कहा जाता है कि हैंडलूम की इस से सहायता मिलेगी। मैं अभी तक यह नहीं समझ सका हूँ कि हैंडलूम को क्या सहायता मिली है। अब वह

समय धा गया है कि गवर्नमेंट यह अनुभव करती है कि हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को मदद की जाये। इस के लिये हमारे सामने इस इंडस्ट्री के फ्रांकड़े तो होना जरूरी है कि देश में कितनी धोतियां हंडलूम से बनती हैं और कितना और किस्म का कपड़ा बनता है और उस की कितनी खपत है। जिस चीज की ज्यादा खपत है उस का उत्पादन बढ़ाया जाय। तो अब तक इस सिलसिले में कोई कदम नहीं उठाया गया है। गवर्नमेंट शायद यह भी नहीं बतला सकती कि कितनी धोतियां हंडलूम से पैदा होती हैं या पैदा की जा सकती हैं। जब तक यह स्थिति मालूम न हो जाये तब तक धोती के उत्पादन पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा देने से कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलेगा। अगर वास्तव में सरकार ने यह तै कर लिया है कि हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को खास तौर पर सहायता करनी है और प्रोत्साहन देना है तो मेरा तो सुझाव यह है कि हम को इस के लिये कोई लॉग टर्म स्टैप लेना चाहिये और इस के लिये सारे देश की स्थिति हमारे सामने होनी चाहिये। अगर हम को काटेज इंडस्ट्री को मदद करना है तो हमें यही नहीं देखना चाहिये कि फलां इंडस्ट्री को मदद मिले। काटेज इंडस्ट्री का जो मूल मूल उद्देश्य है वह यह है कि हर गांव जहां तक हो सके अपने ही यहां का कपड़ा काम में लावे। हमारे सामने महात्मा गांधी जी ने यही नीति रखी थी कि हर सेंटर

Shri Radhelal Vyas: I have taken only three or four minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member started at 4-35.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: No, Sir, not at 4-35. I have spoken only for about 4 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One minute more, then.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): You are very generous, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What am I to do?

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता कि जो मिलें धोतियों का प्रतिरिक्त कोटा तैयार करेंगी उस पर टैक्स लगाने से क्या लाभ होगा। उस का असर तो सारी धोतियों की कीमत पर पड़ेगा। पिछली दफा जो आपने कानून बनाया उस में आपने सारे कपड़े पर टैक्स लगाया था। अब आप केवल प्रतिरिक्त कोटे पर ही टैक्स लगा रहे हैं। यह मैं नहीं समझ सकता। यदि आप मिल के सारे कपड़े पर टैक्स लगाते तो यह मेरी समझ में आ सकता था। लेकिन केवल धोती पर ही टैक्स लगाना अव्यवहारिक है और यह धोती पहनने वालों के साथ सख्ती होगी। इसलिये ऐसा कोई फर्क गवर्नमेंट को नहीं डालना चाहिये।

तीसरी बात जो मुझे निवेदन करनी है वह यह है कि इस हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को प्रोत्साहन देने का उद्देश्य बेकारी को दूर करना है। जहां हम मिलों की इंडस्ट्री को खत्म करना चाहते हैं या कम करना चाहते हैं वहां अगर हंडलूम इंडस्ट्री न हो, तो उस के लिये आप के पास क्या योजना है। यह चीज हमारे सामने नहीं है। श्री मुखर्जी साहब ने कहा कि कुछ मिलें ऐसी हैं कि जिन को मदद देने की जरूरत है। यह चीज भी हमारे सामने नहीं है। उदाहरण के लिये हमारे यहां नजर झली मिल बन्द पड़ी है और उस की वजह से हजार डेढ़ हजार मजदूर बेकार हो रहे हैं। अगर इस मिल को मदद नहीं की जायेगी तो हमारे यहां बेकारी बढ़ेगी। ऐसी योजना कोई गवर्नमेंट के सामने नहीं है। आप को यह जान कर आश्चर्य होगा कि मध्य भारत में केवल बम्बई को छोड़ कर और सब स्टेटों से ज्यादा कपड़ा पैदा होता है, यद्यपि यह एक बहुत छोटी स्टेट है। यह पंचवर्षीय योजना के फ्रांकड़े हैं। यू० पी० जो कि इतनी बड़ी स्टेट है वह मध्य भारत के बराबर कपड़ा उत्पादन करती है। इसलिये सरकार को वहां के कपड़ा उद्योग पर विशेष

[श्री. राबोलाल व्यास]

ध्यान देना चाहिये। अगर वहां कपड़ों उद्योग बढ़ेगा तो वह राज्य टैक्स भी अधिक देगा लेकिन वहां हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को कायम करने के लिये और उस को ज्यादा से ज्यादा प्रोत्साहन देने के लिये सरकार के सामने कोई योजना नहीं है; उस तरफ सरकार का ध्यान नहीं है। एक तरफ जब यह प्लान किया जा रहा है कि मिलों में धोती का उत्पादन कम किया जाय तो उस की कमी को रिप्लेस करने के लिये हमें हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री को अधिक से अधिक प्रोत्साहन देने की जरूरत है।

इस के अलावा हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री में भी एक बात की जरूरत है, अर्थात् स्टैंडर्डाइजेशन की। देश में देखा जाय कि कहां कहां किस तरह की धोती आदि की आवश्यकता है और उसी तरह के उन को डिजाइन दे कर वैसा ही माल तैयार करवाया जाये तो वास्तव में ज्यादा लाभ होगा और लोग उस से लाभ उठा सकेंगे। अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने मुझे समय दिया और कुछ अधिक समय दिया इस के लिये मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूँ।

Shri Bansal: Sir, although the discussion on this Bill has covered a very wide field including the whole textile policy of the Government of India, very few hon. Members have really taken care to see the provisions of the Bill. My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram read the first line of the Statement of Objects and Reasons and said that this Bill has been framed 'with a view to assisting the handloom industry'. In my opinion, this Bill is not meant primarily for that purpose. That purpose was served partly or wholly by the reservation order of the Government of India.

Shri K. C. Sodhia (Sagar): Then, what is the object of this Bill? It is written in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that the restriction was

done with a view to assisting the handloom industry.

Shri Bansal: If you read the Statement of Objects and Reasons, you will find out that... (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member may go on in his own way.

Shri Bansal: The object of this Bill is very simple. In the working of the textile control order, which placed restrictions on the mills from producing dhoties to the extent of their capacity some lacuna was observed. And that lacuna was that certain mills were so situated, as my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee said, that they could not comply fully with this order. I am not justifying the action of those mills at all, but the fact remains that certain mills were so situated, and that position was recognised by the State Governments, and I think connived at by the Central Government. That situation could not be tolerated for long, and therefore some measure had to be devised, to stop that lacuna. The object of this Bill is to stop that lacuna. And this is sought to be done by putting some penal provisions through this Bill. Those penal provisions are that if a particular factory produces dhotis beyond 60 per cent. i.e. beyond the permissible limit, then that factory would be penalised to the extent of about As. 2 to 10 per yard. Some opinions have been expressed that that burden would be passed on to the consumer, and the millowners will get scot-free.

In this Connection, I would like to invite the attention of the House to clause 3 (2): which reads:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), if, in the case of any mill or class of mills, the Central Government is of opinion that due to economic reasons connected with the nature of the machinery or other equipment installed therein a higher percentage than that specified in sub-section (1) should be fixed..."

It means that this provision is being applied only for those mills which, due to economic reasons connected with the nature of the machinery or other equipment installed, are not able to comply with the provisions of that textile control order. The textile control order remains. Under that, Government have ample powers to book those defaulting mills. Therefore what this Bill seeks to do is only to stop the lacuna, in so far as those mills are concerned, which due to economic reasons or due to peculiar circumstances connected with the machinery, are not able to comply fully with the provisions of that order.

An Hon. Member: Why were they not able to comply?

Shri Bansal: That is for the hon. Minister to explain to the House. But as far as I am concerned, I am reading this Bill, and I am bringing these few points to the notice of the House.

The whole textile policy of the Government of India has been discussed, and I am very glad that this opportunity has been taken for that purpose. But what surprised me was that none of the Members asked how the control order has worked after its promulgation in January this year. I would have very much liked to know whether the Members had taken care to find out whether the production of handloom dhotis had gone up during this period or not. I have tried to find it out from all possible sources, but I have not been able to get that information. I would very much like the hon. Minister to say whether the production of handloom dhotis during this period of nearly a year, has gone up. If it has not gone up, then in my humble opinion, the 60 per cent. restriction has gone in vain. In fact, it is worse, because the production of mill-made dhotis has obviously gone down. That has been admitted in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. That was admitted also by Government, while they promulgated the ordinance. They said that the mills had, by and large, conformed to these restrictions.

If you go into the overall figures, you will find that the production of dhotis by mills has been roughly of the order of 60 per cent. as required by the control order. As against this, I would have expected that at least the remaining 40 per cent. were produced by the handloom industry. I am not aware of this being a fact. If it is a fact, I would like the hon. Minister to take the House into his confidence, and give us the figures. After all, we were not interested in restricting the production of mill-made dhotis, but we were interested in increasing the production of handloom dhotis. If that purpose has not been served, in my opinion, we will have to think very seriously about revising our policy or devising other means of increasing the production of handloom dhotis...

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): Or removing the levy also.

Shri Bansal: By all means. We must face these facts very squarely.

Another thing which has happened is that the price of mill-made dhotis has definitely gone up during this period of eleven months. There has been some fall during the last month, but generally, the consistent trend has been that the prices of mill-made dhotis have gone up by about 15 to 40 per cent. depending upon the quality and the period. They have gone up because our people are used to wearing dhotis; the mill production has gone down to 60 per cent. while the handloom production has not gone up, and naturally the price of mill-made dhotis has gone up. My information is that the price of handloom dhotis has also gone up, and the gap between the prices of handloom and mill-made dhotis has remained almost as constant as it was before the promulgation of this control order.

All these facts point to one direction, and that is that our policy of reservation of dhotis to handloom has not very well succeeded and the reasons, to my mind, are obvious. If

[Shri Bansal]

the prices of dhotis increase above a certain level; the consumption is bound to go down because some people are going to take to pyjamas, others are going to use some sort of long-cloth in place of mill or handloom dhotis, and others who used dhotis for *lungis* or *tahamads* may use other types of ordinary cloth. All these things will have to be taken into consideration, when we devise our long-range textile policy.

I am not at all against handlooms. I am one of those few Members in this House, who have been very much exercised, not from today or yesterday but for two years, about the unemployment problem. My hon. friend Shri Nanda knows about it, and I am one with anybody in this House who is able to suggest remedies for removing unemployment. I know our country cannot exist, if we do not find an adequate solution for this problem of unemployment. Therefore, let us not view this problem as an industry versus handloom problem, but as a common problem for all of us concerned. It is our duty to face these problems squarely, but when we go to face them, we must remember one fact, viz that we must reduce the cost structure. You must make the goods available at a reasonable price to the consumer. On the other hand, if you go on raising the price of consumer goods, for all the articles that are being produced, the demand will shrink, and consequently employment also will shrink. This fundamental lesson of economics must be taken to heart by every one of us here. So, when we try to solve this problem, let us sit down and examine how we can bring down our cost structure, and how we can remove most effectively this scourge of unemployment from our country.

6 P.M.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Kanavade Patil.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: Sir, I want to speak for five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have called the hon. Member, Mr. Kanavade Patil.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: Sir, I have requested you to kindly permit me to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot allow the hon. Member.

Shri P. N. Rajabhoj: Then respectfully, I am going to walk out.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I cannot satisfy every hon. Member here who asks me again and again, and I do not like any hon. Member saying he will walk out. I have no objection, if he wants to walk out.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh (Hazari-bagh West): This is a very important measure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We spent the whole of yesterday on this. I will allow half an hour more for this. We must finish this Bill today. That was agreed upon in the Business Advisory Committee yesterday and today—two days—are allotted for this.

डा० राम सु ग सिंह (शाहबाद—दक्षिण):
लेकिन यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बिल है, इस में टाइम मिलना चाहिये।

Shri K. C. Sodhia: I want two minutes.

Shri Kanavade Patil: Sir, I welcome this measure. It is a matter in which everybody is concerned. As every one of us knows, the handloom industry in this country is in a very precarious state of existence. So far as the Bombay State is concerned, I know that the handloom industry is on the point of destruction. The reasons are very obvious, Sir. So far as the cost of production is concerned, it is quite high in the case of the handloom industry when compared with the power-loom or the mill-made cloth. The handloom dhoti is quite fine, and the texture is quite fine, and it can be compared with mill-made cloth.

Looking to the condition of the market so far as the handloom industry is concerned, I think very reasonable arguments have been advanced from this side of the House that there are no market facilities for the handloom industry. From this point of view, Sir, the present Bill is certainly very heartily welcome because it intends to put a restriction on the production of mill-made cloth. The competition of mill with handloom is also very disastrous.

So far as our State is concerned, i.e. Bombay State, I very humbly submit that this Bill should have included sarees also, and restrictions of a similar nature ought to have been placed on the production of sarees. The reason is that by putting such restrictions the handloom weavers would have got an appreciably good market and their Sarees would have been sold at proper prices. Unfortunately, because the mill industry is producing more cloth, especially dhoties and sarees, the handloom industry cannot compete with it and also with the power-looms which are nowadays coming in the rural areas. Persons who have got more money can afford to bring power-looms and the handloom industry is losing all its existence.

I submit, Sir before the House, that we should look at this question from the point of view of the very serious unemployment which is resulting as a result of mill-made cloth being sold at cheaper rates in the rural areas, which deprives the handloom of its market. Then, suppose tomorrow the world war comes. In the event of the world war, if our mill industry which is concentrated in big cities like Bombay and Ahmedabad, is shattered, what will be the supply position of cloth to millions of our countrymen?

Therefore, from various points of view, my humble opinion is that we should allow the handloom industry to continue and to flourish. It is really dangerous to allow it to be

ruined. I do not want to go further as there is not sufficient time. I would certainly welcome this measure which punishes the millowners for producing cloth in excess of the quota permissible under the rules and regulations. With these few words, I resume my seat.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: I want to say only a few sentences.

In the first place, I find that there was no necessity whatsoever for promulgating an Ordinance about this Bill. The necessity for promulgating Ordinances arises only when big questions like those of law and order arise. If questions like these—economic questions—are dealt with in this fashion, the powers of this House are considerably curtailed.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may kindly get into some seat and speak.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: My second point is that this Bill does not give any protection to the handloom industry. The half-hearted measure by which this Government wants to promulgate an order of 60 per cent. is quite out of place, because I think the stand of the Madras Government was quite right, requiring the whole production of dhoties being left to the handloom industry. We know that our people, accustomed as they have been for many years to mill-made cloth, do not like handloom cloth. Therefore, if you want to give real help to the handloom industry, you should just reserve the province of the handloom and not allow the mills to go into that.

The third point is that the definition of 'dhoti' as given in the Bill is altogether wrong. A dhoti of 28 inches width cannot be called a dhoti. Dhoties are worn by men and women and the width of the dhoti is no less than 40 inches. Twentyeight inches means 13 *gira*s, which is less than a yard, and it is used only for children.

My fourth point is that this Government finds itself incompetent to

[Shri K. C. Sodhia]

punish the real mischief makers. Instead of punishing these mischief makers, it wants to punish the poor consumer in this country. This is quite wrong.

I say that this Bill will not succeed in any of its objects and it ought to be thrown overboard by this House.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan (Krishnagiri): Sir, I do not want this Bill to be thrown overboard as suggested. (Interruptions). The arguments of the previous speaker may be correct, but the conclusions are not at all correct. We have to march step by step—by one step, two steps or three steps. There is no use throwing overboard any constructive measure. That is my first point.

No Government, Sir, worth its name can be looking on helplessly when units of organised industry defy its regulations and laws.

Babu Ramnarayan Singh: It is not worth the name.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: Therefore this measure has not come a day too soon. The hon. Minister has not been pleased to give us the list of mills which have defied the regulations. If he had named them on the floor of the House, it would have served as a very good admonition to those recalcitrants.

Further, our economic policy is based on the Five Year Plan. In the Five Year Plan a place has been allotted for cottage industries. Reservations have been made for cottage industries, as against organised industries. That being so, it is very unreasonable on the part of organised industry to defy the laws and regulations which have been devised to protect the cottage industry. The Plan expects every Indian to co-operate, every villager to co-operate and give his voluntary service for the building of roads and the raising of bunds and so on. It does not do well for some units of the organised industries to defy the rules and regulations. Therefore, I welcome this measure and

hope the hon. Minister will not only enforce this measure rigorously but if he finds further loopholes, will devise further measures to put everything right.

Sir, it is not necessary here while discussing this measure to be discussing the entire textile policy of the country. When we previously discussed the Khadi cess Bill we had covered the entire ground and there will be another opportunity when the Textile Enquiry Committee, the High Power Committee which the Government has appointed, submits its report. Meanwhile, if we try to discuss the entire textile policy, say handloom versus the mill industry, we will not be able to do justice to the question. I would urge upon my colleagues for the time being not to indulge in that because half-way discussions will lead us nowhere. I welcome this measure and I hope it will give relief to the handloom industry. It will be wearying the House if I go on giving facts about the conditions of the handloom weavers. I am entitled to speak about them because my district is one of the districts where the largest number of handloom weavers live. They all depend for their livelihood on this. Now, they have gone throughout the country begging. My friends coming from Bombay have told me that these beggars are found there; another of my hon. friends coming from Bihar told me that they are to be found in Patna also. That is the report I am getting.

That is not the only aspect of the matter. If thousands of families resort to begging it is very bad. They first resort to begging, women and children, young and old. Then, later on their moral fibre gets loosened and they continue begging and whenever they get some little work they are not inclined to work. It is very difficult to induce them to go back to work. Thereby these unemployed weavers become a big problem not only for

our administration but also for those who want to deal with corrective institutions. When families get scattered and take to begging it is very difficult to make them work again. This is an aspect of the matter which concerns hundreds and thousands of people. Therefore, I hope the hon. Minister will vigorously push through this measure and see that sufficient relief is given to the handloom weavers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri M. B. Vaishya.

The hon. Member said he is a weaver and I am allowing him to speak.

I would like to know the opinion of the House. If every hon. Member wants to speak, I will allow them to go on speaking endlessly. I have no objection. But the Advisory Committee decision is there. It appears that there is no organisation of parties at all here from the manner in which I am being worried. The leaders of all parties are sitting here. Members know the Advisory Committee thought that this Bill should be finished today. The leaders of parties do not advise their own followers not to intervene and create trouble inside the House. The followers have one way and the leaders have another way. In between them I am getting into trouble. Therefore I will go on allowing the members until they get exhausted. I will take the opinion of the House.

Shri R. K. Chaudhuri: We know one authority in this House and it is yourself, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At 5.30 I will put the question if the House will accept closure. It is left to the House. If it does not accept closure, I will go on calling every hon. Member who wants to speak. I will not take the responsibility of closing it myself.

**श्री एम० बी० वैश्य (अहमदाबाद—
रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियाँ):** उपाध्यक्ष जी,

आज हैंडलूमस सारे देश में फैले हुए हैं। देश का कोई भाग ऐसा नहीं है जहाँ हैंड लूमस बीवर्स काम न करते हों। हमारे देश में २५ से ३० लाख हैंडलूमस थे और उन पर एक या डेढ़ करोड़ जनता निर्भर होती थी। मगर मिलों के बनने के बाद जो कपड़ा हमारे देश में करघे से पैदा होता था वह मिलों से पैदा होना शुरू हुआ और इस से लाखों और करोड़ों जनता को अपना धंधा मिलना बन्द हो गया। आप यह कहते हैं कि मिलों में साड़ी, धोतियों का ६० परसेंट ही बनाया जाय और ४० फीसदी धोतियाँ हैंडलूमस पर बनाई जायें। मैं जिस प्रवेश से आता हूँ उस गुजरात, सौराष्ट्र और कच्छ में लाखों की तादाद में लोग हैंडलूमस पर काम करते हैं खास कर उस में हरिजन लोग हैं। इन चार पांच वर्षों में उन की क्या दशा हुई है? पहले तो सूत की कोई सुविधा नहीं मिलती थी अब थोड़ी सी मिलने लगी है तो उन का कपड़ा बहुत मंहगा पड़ता है। कई दिन तक मेहनत करने के बाद सूत से वह कपड़ा बन कर इतना मंहगा हो जाता है कि उस को बाजार में चने में मुसीबत होती है। पहिले तो मिलों ने महीन कपड़ा बनाना शुरू किया पर अब तो २० नम्बर तक का सूत भी वह बुनती हैं, किसान और मजदूर जो हैंडलूम का बहुत टोस और मजबूत कपड़ा पहिनते थे उन को अब मिल के कपड़े की लालच हो गई है और चूँकि मिल का कपड़ा सस्ते में मिल जाता है इसलिये वह मिल का ही कपड़ा खरीदते हैं। सरकार इतने शुद्ध भाव से जो यह बिल लाई है उस की भावना तो, बहुत अच्छा है, लेकिन उस में जो कुछ रक्खा गया है उस से हैंडलूम वालों को कोई खास लाभ नहीं होगा, इस से कोई भी फायदा लोगों को हो सकेगा ऐसा नहीं लगता। इस में लिखा हुआ है कि इस से हमारे तमाम करघे के मजदूरों को और करघे पर काम करने वालों को फायदा पहुँचेगा। हम सब इस आशा

[श्री एम० बी० वैश्य]

पर बैठे थे कि जब बिल हमारे यहां प्रायेगा तो उस से बहुत फायदा होगा। लेकिन उस से कुछ नहीं हुआ। इस में लिखा हुआ है कि दूसरे लोगों को भी फायदा होगा। अब हम चाहते हैं कि सरकार इस पर गौर से अपना ध्यान दे देश में लाखों की तादाद में लोग बेकार बैठे हुए हैं। मिलों को बनाने के लिये तो बाहर से सामान और मशीनरी लानी पड़ती है लेकिन हंडलूम तो जिस गांव में लोग रहते हैं उन में ही बनती हैं। मैं वीवर होने के नाते कह सकता हूं कि हमारे छोटे से घर में एक मिल बन जाती है। घर के सारे आदमी उस पर काम करने लग जाते हैं। वहां कोई किसी को डिसमिस नहीं कर सकता, लाक आउट नहीं कर सकता। अगर हम को सुविधा मिलती रहे तो हम अपने घर के सभी आदमी आठ, दस घंटे भी बैठ कर कपड़ा बना सकते हैं वह कपड़ा देश भर में अच्छे से अच्छा होता है, लेकिन मिल वाले जो पैसे वाले हैं उन को ज्यादा पैसा न मिले इस का तो कुछ इन्तजाम हो। हम हंडलूम वालों को तो अपना पेट भरना है, उन को अपने पास पैसा नहीं बढ़ाना है, न हमें मोटर खरीदना है। वह तो केवल अपने पेट के लिये चाहते हैं कि सरकार कुछ समय तक इतनी व्यवस्था कर दे। हम डाके की मलमल की बात सुनते हैं, हम को मालूम होता है कि हमारे देश में महीन कपड़ा बनता था, वह कपड़ा बनाने वाले आज भी पड़े हुए हैं, लेकिन उन को सुविधा नहीं मिलती। इसलिये मेरी विनती है कि कम से कम २० नम्बर के सूत को जो कि मिलों में बुना जाता है बन्द कर दिया जाय और २० नम्बर तक का सूत सिर्फ हंडलूम पर ही बनाया जाय जिस से खेतिहर मजदूर और किसानों को मजबूत कपड़ा मिले वह अच्छा बुना हुआ और ठोस बुना हुआ हो और वह ज्यादा समय तक चल सके और उन को फायदा भी हो।

सरकार यह बिल बड़े शुद्ध हृदय से लाई है इसलिये मेरी विनती है कि इस बिल में यह हो कि जो कर लगेगा वह सरकार हंडलूम और करघों को ठीक करने में खर्च करेगी। इस में ऐसा कुछ नहीं लिखा हुआ है। इस में लिखा हुआ है कि जो विशेष कोटा धोतियों का दिया हुआ है उस से अगर कोई ज्यादा बनायेगा तो उस पर २ आ० से ८ आ० तक कर लगाया जायेगा। लेकिन उस कर का होगा क्या? वह सरकारी तिजोरी में चला जाय तो इस से तो कोई फायदा होगा नहीं। अगर फायदा करना है, इस देश में हंडलूम की उन्नति करनी है, इस देश में हंडलूम मजदूरों और करघों पर काम करने वालों को जीता रखना है तो मेरी विनती है कि सरकार को इस बिल में कुछ ऐसा करना चाहिये कि जिस से हंडलूम के धंधे को कुछ सहायता हो सके। यह धंधा बरसों से हमारे देश में चलता था, हमारे यहां का कपड़ा दुनिया भर में जाता था और जिस से लोग आश्चर्य चकित हो जाते थे अगर वही कपड़ा हम अपने देश वालों को नहीं पहिना सकते तो उस से क्या फायदा होगा?

जो सरकार यह बिल लाई है अगर वही सरकार अपने कामों के लिये भी हंडलूम का कपड़ा इस्तेमाल करे तो इस से देश को बहुत कुछ लाभ हो सकता है। लेकिन अगर सरकार औरों के लिये तो यह बात करे लेकिन अपने लिये कुछ न करे तो इस से कोई फायदा नहीं हो सकता। मेरी विनती यह है कि जहां सरकार को एक टुकड़े कपड़े की भी जरूरत हो अगर वहां वह पहले खादी और दूसरे नम्बर पर हंडलूम का कपड़ा खरीदे तो इस से देश को बहुत लाभ हो सकता है। हमारे यहां कारीगर बहुत हैं और वह बहुत कपड़ा तैयार कर सकते हैं लेकिन उन के तैयार किये हुए कपड़े के लिये बाजार नहीं है।

एक महोदय ने कहा था कि सरकार को वह कपड़ा खरीदना चाहिये। हम अपने कपड़े को कम कीमत पर भी देने को तैयार हैं लेकिन क्या करें बड़ी मुसीबत से सूत मिलता है और वह भी मंहगा मिलता है। इसी लिये कपड़ा मंहगा हो जाता है और वह बिकता नहीं है। यह बहुत बड़ी मुसीबत है। तो अगर सरकार इस कपड़े के लिये बाजार पैदा कर दे तो उस से इस उद्योग को बहुत प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा और हमारा देश सुखी हो जायेगा और गांवों में जो बेकारी फैल रही है वह कम हो जायेगी। अगर कहीं शहर में बेकारी हो जाती है तो उस के लिये बहुत कुछ कहा जाता है लेकिन इन बेचारे गांव वालों की कोई बात नहीं कहता जो कि भूखे पड़े हुए हैं और जिनको खाने की बड़ी मुसीबत है। वह अच्छे कारीगर होते हुए भी अपना पेट नहीं भर सकते हैं। इस दशा को सुधारने के लिये मैं माननीय सदस्यों से और मंत्री महोदय से विनती करता हूँ कि वह इस बिल को इस तरह से लायें कि यह उद्योग जिन्दा रह सके और कारीगरों को ठीक तौर से मदद मिले। जो आप ने मुझे समय दिया उस के लिये मैं आप का अत्यन्त आभारी हूँ।

Shri Gopala Rao (Gudivada): I have been very anxious to speak on this Bill from the very beginning. My only anxiety is to draw the attention of the Government and the country at large to the serious character of this problem in order to see that something concrete is done to these suffering millions, which is a big problem. If any measure is seriously and sincerely brought by Government, we are prepared to give them complete support, but, as a matter of fact, can this measure solve the problem at all? In the Objects and Reasons, it is said that this Bill is brought forward to assist the handloom industry, but if you review the whole policy of the Government for the last three or four

years, it is clear that not a single problem is solved. Today the position is in no way better. The problem is assuming vast dimensions and the efforts made by the Government, it seems, do not realise the gravity of the situation. They are moving very slowly in the matter as if it is a normal affair. If you go to the villages and see the conditions, you will find a very unhappy picture there. For example, in Andhra—one of our friends has already said this—and in the Tamilnad, people are actually suffering, starving and begging in the streets. It is no exaggeration when I say that there are several starvation deaths. Not only that. There are several cases of suicide and before they commit suicide, they have written direct to Shri C. Rajagopalachari why they are putting an end to their lives. They could not give bread to their children and so they were putting an end to their lives. This, Sir, is the position. During the last one month or so, in Andhra demonstrations and satyagraha are going on. The handloom weavers are forced to adopt satyagraha, but the State Government also is trying to shirk their responsibility in the matter. In one of the statements, the Chief Minister stated that the Centre was not prepared to give the cess or allot a portion of it to Andhra Government. There must be a co-ordinated scheme between the Centre and the States to solve this problem. But what do these poor people want after all? They want work. They say "give us yarn at cheap rate and take our products; show us work and protect our industry and save our lives". These are simple demands and any responsible Government should take up these demands and bring forward a solution. But what do the Government do? As my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram pointed out, they are adopting a repressive policy; they are arresting hundreds of people and using tear gas and making lathi charges. Can these measures solve the problem? Certainly not. The situation is deteriorating day by day and it is explosive. Unless the Government realises this and

[Shri Gopala Rao]

comes forward with a definite measure, there is no hope. After all, what the people want is work, employment, yarn at cheaper rates and a market for their products. From one of the statements recently made by the hon. Minister—I have seen it in the newspapers—it seems that it was difficult for him to solve this knotty problem, because on the one side heavy industries have to be assisted and on the other small and cottage industries have to be developed. He found some difficulty in solving the problem. But as far as the present situation is taken into consideration, I say there will be no such difficulty provided the Government is prepared to increase the purchasing capacity of the people, provided the Government is prepared to control the margin of the profit of certain classes, provided the Government is prepared to adopt a popular policy. After all, for a country consisting of 36 crores of people, we are only producing 500 or 600 million yards of cloth which comes to 13 or 14 yards per head. This is nothing. We know that the average consumption *per capita* in 1939-40 was 16 yards, whereas after the advent of this Government, the purchasing capacity of the people has fallen to such a low level that the average consumption figure has come to 9 or 10 yards. Even according to the five year programme, this figure is not increasing very much. Government may speak loud from house tops and they have brought this ordinance or that, but these will not solve the problem. According to my information Government have now collected Rs. 3½ crores of cess, but in what way this has been utilised! They say they are preparing schemes, the States are preparing schemes and so on. Schemes and plans are only on paper, and actually the people are starving—without food, without clothes and without anything—in the streets. The people in Andhra say “At least open some gruel centres so that we may live until we can get a reasonable amount of yarn for our production.” That is why

I propose that this amount of Rs. 3 crores or something about that, to be collected by way of cess should be immediately given for some unemployment relief and for opening centres and for the supply of yarn at cheap rates, and thus try to solve this problem with the help of the people. If you take such serious steps to solve the problem, certainly every political party in the country will co-operate with the Government. But this measure, as it is, cannot help to solve the problem. That is why I ask the hon. Minister to come forward with a definite step and definite plan. Something concrete must be done here and now. That is what I mean to say.

Shri U. S. Malliah (South Kanara—North): I beg to move:

“That the question be now put.”

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

“That the question be now put.”

The motion was adopted.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, I had no idea when I brought this comparatively simple measure before the House that I should be raising a veritable hornet's nest round my head. It is partly due to the fact that quite a number of hon. Members perhaps on both sides of the House have not understood the scope of this measure. Perhaps, it is due to the fact that I have not explained the measure quite properly to them. Or, it might be that each person had his own particular hobby horse and had to ride it, and this Bill provided the opportunity. Well, Sir, in a debating assembly, everything that provides for letting off hot steam is good and from that point of view I welcome the discussion. I did hope that the discussion would be a little more realistic, taking into account the facts, as they are, and that the hon. Members would have offered some constructive suggestions. On the other hand, Sir, with practically very few exceptions, all that has been said was destructive. “This Bill will do no good. All

this you are doing for handlooms will do no good. All that you are doing for the mills will do harm.' Well, I can understand my hon. friend Mr. Gopala Rao speaking in the manner he did. But that is only proper. He has to oppose, but even he was a little halting probably because he has some soft corner for me. Otherwise, he would have gone hammer and tongs for the Government. That is a thing which I can understand. But I cannot understand, Sir, the very sweeping condemnation of everything that Government has done—talking of all things which do not concern this particular measure and going full steam ahead with their own particular arguments irrespective of their relevance.

Let me repeat now what I had stated at the beginning about this measure. This measure merely seeks to put a check on mills which are inclined to transgress the Control Order imposed on them sometime in November, 1952, restricting their production of dhoties to 60 per cent. As I said, it is a self-acting device. If any mill transgresses the limit, then it will attract the penal excise duty. Progressively it will go on increasing the penal levy but that does not mean that the Control Order is dead. It is alive.

An Hon. Member: What about prosecution?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: We have powers to prosecute. Well, the powers to prosecute still remain. There has been no repeal of the powers under the Control Order.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South) rose—

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The hon. Member can ask me questions towards the end. I do not want my trend of thought, which is pretty loose at the moment, to be disturbed.

That is the real position. Well what is it that, hon. Members object to? Do they object to my imposing 60 per cent. check on the production of

Dhoties by mills? If they do, let them say so. Then the Bill might be thrown out, and along with it I must also withdraw my Control Order, because it would be a mandate that I get from the House to do so. If hon. Members want this Bill to be withdrawn or to be thrown out, let every hon. Member understand what the result of it would be. If they do not want this Bill to go on, it means that I have got to withdraw my control order and allow mills to produce as much dhoties as they like.

Several Hon. Members: Why?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That would be the mandate from the House,—not to penalize production on any excess over 60 per cent. If now the House does not want any penal excise duty in respect of mills which produce more than the 60 per cent. of dhoties of what they produced before—the obvious conclusion that I have to draw is—as a man of common sense, I believe I have some common sense left even though I have been a Minister for 18 months—is that the House does not approve of any limitation on the production of dhoties. That is the logical conclusion to which anybody has to come.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: That is a misunderstanding.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I say that is my understanding.

Shri H. G. Vaishnav: It is a licence for the mills to produce more,—this excise duty.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The hon. Member need not get excited about it. I am giving an explanation so far as common sense will permit me. If my hon. friend gives the go-by to semantics, by all means let him imagine whatever he wants. He might say: "the world is going down tomorrow." Well, I cannot prevent him from imagining that. There are among the people in Agra, Ranchi, Bangalore and Madras—very many other places who believe that they are the Queen of England or the Duke of Edinburgh. I cannot prevent

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

their doing so. You can imagine any thing. This is a free world, and even a lunatic is permitted free-thinking, and has the freedom to think what he likes. I understand the language as I have read it in school, and I think, I still understand semantics. And my understanding today is that this Bill actually seeks to endorse a particular order which Government has issued in November, 1952, imposing a restriction in respect of dhoties to 60 per cent. of what they produced over a particular period. Well, this Bill is more or less—the House giving its imprimatur—its mandate on the decision that has been taken. Now, there is no use drawing any other conclusion saying, 'well; this means something else is happening. The Textile Control Order becomes null and void.' It may become null and void for other reasons, but it does not become null and void because of this Bill. There has been no repeal of the Textile Control Order. I do not know what the hon. Members want. Nobody has told me what they want. Nobody has told me.....

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South): They tried, but you did not hear.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If so many hon. Members have spoken—I have lost count of what they said or—I cannot keep count of what has been said, and if after so many Members have spoken, I cannot see light,—merely because if my hon. friend Mr. Dhulekar had also spoken I will get light,—well, I am prepared to admit it. He is perhaps the only person that can shed light, and he has been prevented from speaking by the Chair. I think it is quite possible. There has been such a mixture of motives in these arguments and I will deal with them before long. What I want to say now is, out of the very many points raised by my hon. friends, I differ vitally from my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, who

lets fling a shot and does not wait for a return. He asked me: "A Bill was passed. The House approved of a taxation measure. What has happened?" Yes. "What has happened?" He is entitled to ask. Hon. Members have asked many questions during the course of this discussion. It only means, Sir, that hon. Members were not here during the question hour. Very many hon. Members are interested in what is being done in regard to handlooms and khadi. Innumerable number of questions have been asked both in the last session and in this session, and I have given answers. I have told them: "Schemes have come from so many Governments. Moneys have been made available." I have said that very nearly three and a half crores of rupees are to be spent on the schemes that have been approved in regard to Handloom Industry. Moneys have been made available. I have said so on the last occasion. Then, I had received schemes from eight States. And I here have schemes from 27 States which have all been approved of. It aggregates to an amount of Rs. 3½ crores for the purpose of helping handlooms. And my hon. friend Mr. Gopala Rao says: "People are starving and are committing suicide". Well, on the subject of these suicides, oftentimes, there are two things which are the patents of communism, that is, a person has to confess a thing which he has never done or believes. And then, later on, he has to commit suicide. I quite agree it is a thing which goes with communism, and therefore my hon. friend imagines that would be suicide. They write letters to Shri Rajagopalachari but Shri Rajagopalachari. I do not know whether this would be suicide, confides in Mr. Gopala Rao or not, does not prevent the suicide. There is of course nothing to talk about it here. And Mr. Gopala Rao asks: "What have you done?" Must I give this Rs. 3½ crores to Mr. Gopala Rao so that he can fight elections. Then it is very logical to ask that the money be given to him.

Shri Gopala Rao: That means you refuse to learn from him.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I refuse to yield any place to communism. I refuse to accept your bonafides. I refuse to believe that you do any good to the people. (*Interruption.*) I refuse to believe that anything good can come from that section of the House. I stand firm in that refusal to believe in all these matters and it does not matter what Mr. Kadiyala Gopala Rao says. I am not going to yield to him.

Dr. Rama Rao: What has all this to do with the Bill?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: One has nothing to do with the other—I have no doubt about it.

Several Hon. Members: Do not worry about it.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have to worry about everything! If anybody has to worry, I am the man who has to worry about so many things that has been said in the course of this debate.

That, Sir, in sum, is my answer to Dr. Lanka Sundaram. I hope the Press will take it up and he will see it in the newspapers early enough tomorrow morning and feel satisfied. I do not want Dr. Lanka Sundaram to be dissatisfied.

Let me now say something in regard to khadi. We have sanctioned schemes to the extent of nearly a couple of crores of rupees—Rs. 1 crore 93 lakhs. Moneys have been made available; moneys are being spent. You might ask: "When are you going to place all the details before the House?" We have only taken a token grant of Rs. 2 crores. That means the principle of the expenditure has been approved by the House. I shall certainly come before the House with a supplementary grant to cover the rest of the expenditure. That will be the time to put me on the carpet, either to say that the money has been well spent, or ill spent; that

the schemes have been good or the schemes have been bad.

There is one other matter which I would like to mention even now. The Government of India has no organisation of its own. It has got to spend through State Governments or through bodies like the All India Khadi and Village Industries Association, and all this does take time. It does not mean that I cannot hand over the money in cash, as Mr. Kadiyala Gopala Rao wants. It does take time to spend the money.

But it must also be realised, Sir, that out of respect for the views expressed in this House, an elected House, the grant for khadi and village industries, handloom and handicrafts which were in the past in the region of Rs. 20 lakhs and odd before has now gone up very nearly to Rs. 7 crores. It is no mean achievement. I need not feel ashamed of it. But the money has to be spent in a manner which will be approved of by the Auditor-General. I cannot merely throw the money away, or hand it over to Mr. Gopala Rao, because the Auditor-General won't approve of it. It has got to be spent in a manner which he will approve; it does take time.

Sir, let me now mention the scheme for Madras. The scheme sent up by Madras is that the money has to be spent through more or less co-operative societies. And curiously enough, whatever might be said against Madras, the co-operative movement has, so far as handloom weavers are concerned, succeeded to a degree which cannot be compared with the success of co-operative movement in any other part of India,—bar Bombay. I am sorry my hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee is not here. He said co-operative movement should no longer be considered only as a credit movement. Everybody realises it. Here this Rs. 3½ lakhs for handlooms is being spent very largely through co-operative societies. That is the check that we can have against misuse or waste of these funds.

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

My hon. friend Mr. Gadgil mentioned something about the total quantum of handloom weavers that exist. As he said the census figures do not support the view that there are 28 lakhs' less 4 lakhs in Assam, that is 24 lakhs looms because for every loom there must be 2 persons working. The census figures do not support the statement that there are 48 lakhs of people living on the handloom industry in India bar Assam. The census figures fall short of it. It may be said by way of explanation that a handloom weaver also happens to be an agriculturist and he comes under the category 'agriculturist'. But nonetheless there are not 48 lakhs of handloom weavers in India bar Assam. That is a grim fact which everybody has to accept.

It is no use my hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram saying: we have got 3½ lakhs of handlooms in Andhra. They have not. The total number of handlooms in Madras, even according to exaggerated figures which was computed at the time when quota cards were issued, were only 8 lakhs, out of which 2/3rd are in the residuary Madras and only 1/3rd in Andhra. It has now been found in the checks that have been made, sample surveys that have been conducted, that there are only 55 per cent. of the looms which are genuine looms in most parts. So 8 lakhs is not a reality; it is a fiction. Out of that you have to deduct 45 per cent. Out of what is left you have got 1/3rd of the looms roughly in Andhra State. It is no use, for the purpose of effect, because friends in the press gallery are willing to report anything that is said against Government, to make a statement of this sort and say that is the reality.

Sir, these schemes are under way and we do hope to be able to spend the money through the co-operative societies. It may be that quite a lot of people are not willing to come under scheme working through the co-

operative societies. I can mention, Sir, one particular type of instance. There were so-called weavers who have been living on quota cards. They had a quota card for yarn purchase before and the yarn dealer was prepared to purchase that quota card at the rate of Rs. 40 per month. Now that is gone because our supply of yarn is plentiful. These people who were getting Rs., 40 a month had nothing to show except a ghost loom. It is these people who want gruel centres. They are not prepared to do any work.

Shri Gopala Rao: People are ready to work; but there is no work.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a statement by an individual, a member of the Communist Party. My statement is based on the statement of the Government. Anyway it does not matter very much whether my hon. friend believes me or not. The point is that the actual number of handloom weavers estimated varies very largely. Out of the quota card holders there are some who are not prepared to come into the cooperative societies. That is our difficulty. In time, perhaps, they will come into the co-operative societies. If they are proper weavers and they want to work they will come into the co-operative societies.

If the charge is levelled against Government—whether it is State, or the Central Government, that the remuneration paid by the co-operative societies is not adequate, I shall plead guilty to the charge. I would say that the co-operative societies which give 10 annas or 12 annas do not give adequate wages. Hon. Members who come from Malabar—nobody is in the House now—will probably know that so far as the handloom worker in a factory is concerned, his labour is sweated labour. There is a contractor there; there are about 50 looms, 60 looms or 100 looms in each factory. It is run sometimes on the basis of a limited company. The

wages paid there are sweated wages. But that is a different point altogether. We have to do something to see that that position is improved. But let us come back to see how it affects the entire economy of the country.

It is no use saying that the consumer will have to pay. The consumer will pay whatever you do; whatever improvement you want to effect in the adjustment of vital claims of handloom and mill industry. Suppose you have a pool, either as Mr. Gadgil put it or as Dr. Krishnaswami put it. If you have a pool you have to pool the value of goods produced on an uneconomic basis along with the value of goods produced on an economic basis and thus prices must go up. Well, in Russia, which is a very advanced country and for whose economy I have got the greatest admiration—and I have known about Russia long before my hon. friends of the Communist Party knew about it—the entire basic system of taxation is based on the turnover tax. It is a consumption tax. The bulk of the taxes levied are in the nature of consumption taxes. It has been rising steadily like poison. From 1931 to 1939, for which we have authentic figures, the rise has been nine times. So, ultimately taxation, in whatever form, happens to be on consumption. If you equalise two types of industry, the efficient and the inefficient or less efficient industry, then, altogether the price of the product pooled has to go up.

There is one point which my hon. friends of the Communist Party have made which has a relevance. I am prepared to admit. The entire problem comes back to the question of the purchasing power of the common man. I quite agree with them in regard to what they have said on this matter. That is the point which my hon. friend Shri Hiren Mukerjee made, and that is a right point. Purchasing power is the basic trouble, so far as we are concerned. The logical result of mere pooling will be that

prices will go up. If, as has been suggested by somebody, we say that mills should not produce dhoties—leave alone sarees for the time being—what will happen? Dhoties will be produced by the handlooms. The handloom weaver certainly has to get a higher price. Who will pay the higher price? It will be the consumer. You have got to reconcile to the fact that if this reservation is carried to its logical end, ultimately the price will have to be paid by the consumer. What we do now is to restrict the quantity of cheap goods so that the consumer can go in for the costly ones. The penal excise which will put up the prices might give an indirect protection to the handloom weaver and handloom dhoties. You cannot by any stretch of imagination vary the fact that you will have to ask the consumer to pay, whatever you do. If I pool the suggestions of hon. Members here—right and left and centre—I come back to the sum total of it. Ultimately it means taxing the consumer. And you cannot tax the consumer without any reference to his purchasing power. And that is a point certainly I would yield to the Communist Party. Purchasing power is vital in the matter of consumption. And there can be no production without consumption.

My hon. friend Mr. Chatterjee said 'produce or perish'. Now they say 'produce and perish'—very nice, trite, which in a law court might produce some amusement in a Judge and you may get a point in your favour. The fact remains that when you are in short supply, the nation has to produce or perish. But when you have to reconcile yourself to two types of units, with perhaps an over-production in the economic unit and under-production in the uneconomic unit, certainly by the over-production in the economic unit the uneconomic unit will perish. It is a grim fact. And we do not want the uneconomic unit to go under. We have no difference of opinion on this point. We are determined to keep the uneconomic worker alive. It may be some people

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

might say you must keep him alive for all time. But I am prepared to keep him alive till such time as I can give him an economic wage, until I can shift him on to something more economic, where instead of ten annas per day as a handloom worker he might get three rupees as a carpenter or brick-layer does or five rupees as a mill hand. That is my ambition. I do not know about the ambition of others. I am not prepared to allow him to die. It is common ground between all of us. It may be that some of us ideologically might be against machines, while some of us might be in favour of machines. It is also quite true, as my hon. friend Shri Hiren Mukerjee pointed out, that this question of the mill industry cannot be evaluated in terms of labour content on the exact quantum of labour it employs. 800,000 is not the labour dependent on the mill industry. There are quite a lot of people who produce and gin cotton, who supply material, coal and other necessities for the mill, and others who distribute mill goods. In terms of the number of people who are dependent on it, it may be seven, eight, ten or twelve times the actual labour content of a mill. I went to Bhadravati three months back. It was a hamlet previously; it has now a population of sixty thousand whereas the labour content is only five thousand there. For fifty miles north-west and twenty-five miles in other directions people are dependent on it. There are people who supply bamboo, charcoal. They supply all the necessities of life to the sixty thousand people who live there.

There is no use our missing the real crux of an economic fact. In terms of ultimate labour content a big industry is as important as a small one. But what we cannot do is in the process of transition we cannot allow anybody to suffer. A government which does so has no right to stay in power. The only difference between me and some other friends is while

they say 'let the cottage industry worker stay put for all time' I say 'No, I beg leave to differ'. I do not say he has to stay put in that stage. If I can make the handloom worker function on an economic basis let him stay. If he makes a Banarsi saree for which there is a ready market let him stay. If he makes a fine fabric for which I can find a foreign market let him stay. But if he can only produce rough goods which can be sold only on the basis of an increased burden on a poor consumer, we have to find other employment for him. That is the only difference between my philosophy and that of some of my friends on this side.

I have been asked: what are the results of your restriction? Sir, it is a long story. I do not know if it is the intention of the House that I should bore them to death. If that is their intention I will go on further with my story. I will take the instance of one particular province. After we imposed this restriction of 60 per cent and also perhaps, to a very small extent, manipulated transport permits which we give, the quantum of dhoties that went to Madras—which used to be 5,100 bales, on the basis of the Madras Government's own estimates, every month—dropped to roughly 1,000 and a little less. Some months it went down to 900, some months it went up to 1,100. So there are 4,000 bales of mill dhoties less that went to Madras. Sir, it is certainly an achievement. It may be on the overall we expected that 15,000 bales less would be produced. But here I am showing that in one particular province there has been a reduction in the consumption of mill-made dhoties by about 80 per cent. It may be that the consumer there has paid more for the handloom goods. But that is not the question. I am merely saying that my policy has succeeded to the extent that it has contacted the consumption of mill-made goods in Madras from 5,100 bales to 1,000. I am prepared to prove it. Figures speak for themselves. I

have no hand in the manipulation of these figures. The figures here are supplied by the Textile Commissioner, and I can place the figures at the disposal of the House.

Well, Sir, it has been difficult for us to evaluate—in fact I can do that but it will take more time. But what I have said shows the policy—may be, as I said, clumsy—has succeeded. It is no use forcing it down the throat of a man who speaks the truth. Many things we do are clumsy. They do not look logical. After all logic is not life. Life is itself clumsy. We have faces that are ugly, that are not photogenic. Many of the devices we employ are clumsy, because our economic knowledge is imperfect and that of every economics professor is imperfect. That is why the world suffers from bad advice. But if it has been effective, as in the case of Madras by reducing the consumption of mill-made dhoties by 80 per cent. I think I am entitled to take some credit for it though I will give credit to my erstwhile leader, Shri Rajagopalachari. He is the man who compelled us to do it. He certainly has got the wisdom to see the advantage to his state. I do not propose to labour more on that point. That is the net result of the achievement.

6 P.M.

On the overall picture, as I said, the production has come down and it is in the region of about 29,000 bales. Our target was 30,000. There were mills which misbehaved, forty and odd. That is the figure given. That is true. Forty mills do not make 400. Because 40 mills misbehaved and 400 did not, we were able to get down the production from an average of 50,000 bales at one time—45,000 was the optimum that we needed—down to 29,000 bales. There has been a large measure of success attendant on this experiment. We are dealing in this particular measure with marginal cases of deviation. I do feel in all conscience that, while in particular areas, for economic reasons, you have to allow certain mills to produce a little more, an increase in the cost of

production of dhoties imposed by this measure is a good thing in so far as handlooms are concerned. It will enable the handloom weaver in that locality to compete. Incidentally, it will act as a check on the competition by mill dhoties. I have not divested myself of my powers under the Textile Control Order. If under the Textile Control Order, I can prosecute a mill, I can still prosecute a mill. There is no estoppel so far as this matter is concerned. If I have the power, I have the power still. I have not divested myself of that power. There has been no repeal so far as that is concerned.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: How does that power remain after this Bill is passed?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: My hon. friend is a lawyer. I cannot advise a lawyer. He has to study the books and see. Unless there is a provision for repeal, the power that existed remains. If the power did not exist, I cannot put in something there. If it existed, it still remains in some form or other. He says that this Bill is a virtual repeal. May be that a Judge who holds the same opinion as Shri Sinhasan Singh might say, merely because you have passed a measure for a punitive excise duty, you are estopped from prosecuting the person. He might say even before this, why should you prosecute because I do not like it. Ultimately, the final judges happen to be the Supreme Court people. Whatever they say is the law of the land. I am not a lawyer. Nor can I go into the minds of the people who administer justice. All that I can say is, I have not repealed the powers that I possessed under the Textile Control Order. Those powers still remain.

Speaking about Bengal, my hon. friend Shri G. D. Somani said that the State Governments disobey. I think he must leave this question of disobedience to be determined by the two Governments. Our relationship with all the States happens to be extremely pleasant. In fact, I can say without really disclosing a secret, that

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

I did write to all the Chief Ministers about this. I spoke to them when they came here for the National Development Council. By and large they agreed. What they did not agree to, as some hon. Members both on this side and the other side did not agree, was that there should be any restriction at all on the production of dhoties. They said, well, the consumer price goes up. My hon. friend Shri Gadgil said that prices have gone up. At the same time, they want to protect the handloom weaver. Perhaps, the nature of the handloom industry varies from State to State. In Madras they produce sarees and dhoties. Somewhere else, they may produce langdas. Somewhere else they may produce something else and they may not produce dhoties. I know it for a fact that in the United Provinces or rather in the Uttar Pradesh which it has become now, it remaining UP all the time, during 1950 when there was a shortage in dhoties and the Central Government passed the order to which Shri Gadgil also referred, that 50 per cent of the wide width looms be reserved for the purpose of production of sarees and dhoties, the U.P. Government had persuaded about 10,000 handlooms to weave dhoties, in order to supply the sort-fall. The handlooms in UP are not very seriously affected by mill dhoties going in there. In fact, the total quantity of dhoties that was going into the UP before the Control Order was the highest as compared with any other State, in India. It reached nearly 9,000 bales a month. But, today, for some reason or other, possibly because of the increased purchasing power, while they were consuming about 6,500 bales of sarees the consumption of sarees have gone up to 14,000 bales. May be some people are using sarees as dhoties. It is also a fact that so far as the Punjab, the UP, Bihar, Bengal and Orissa are concerned the consumption of mill goods during the last 8 or 9 months has increased phenomenally. The increased production of these mills has gone primarily to these areas where

apparently living conditions have been better. We have had a progressive diminution in the off-take in the central and southern parts of India. All that I hope is that, with the monsoon conditions being what they are today, my hon. friend and colleague the Food and Agriculture Minister hoping for very good harvests, incidentally some benefit will come to me and that this increased production of cloth would be taken over by the entire country where there will be more or less even prosperity all over. Because, after all, even in those days when I studied economics, I was told that Indian economic is a gamble in the monsoon and this time the gamble has come off. So, therefore, it may be that particular States do not like this measure because it does not affect their economy normally if it is the other way about. On the other hand, prices of dhoties go up and they do not like it. I do not mind admitting that my predecessor in office and my friend, hon. Shri Hare Krushna Mahatab, has been complaining of the prices of dhoties in Orissa. We have got to do something about it. Of course, my friend Mr. H. N. Mukerjee says "let us have controls", but does he realise that a man who is control-minded, unlike my hon. friend and colleague the Food and Agriculture Minister, had to de-control because the alternative was on controlled prices. I had to give an increased price of 12½ per cent on the basis of the price of cotton. Cotton prices had gone up. I resisted doing it for nine months, but I could not resist doing it for a longer time. So, instead of that, I de-controlled and I de-controlled on the gamble that production was so good that prices would come down. Prices did come down. They came down by 20 per cent. And sometimes control proves to be a wrong thing. When the law of supply and demand does operate, when the supply is on the high side, if we have controls, we are merely artificially bolstering up the prices, because you can only work

on the basis of particular profit margins, of particular costs for particular services. So, there this gamble has paid. By and large the prices of goods have come down, but dhoties have not for the reason of restricted production.

It may be that the mill-owners are making money, but the remedy is not what my hon. friend Mr. Gadgil has suggested. Once I pool again the production of handlooms and mills, I shall, unless I subsidise entirely the higher cost of the handlooms, again put up the purchase price so far as the consumer is concerned, and in a country with very high marginal rate of consumption propensity any increase in price attracts immediately the law of diminishing returns.

So, these are very complex factors, and there is no short-cut solution to any of them. We have to go on the basis of trial and error and I am asserting we are going on with my scheme of helping handlooms. We are spending Rs. 3½ Crores on handlooms. I would be spending another Rs. 2 crores on Khadi. Next year we shall be spending more.

Hon. Members have moved an amendment, an amendment which perhaps might be ruled out of order or accepted by you as being in order, but nonetheless which I am unable to accept that this fund should be earmarked for the development of Handloom. I say there is no need so to earmark. We are committed to this policy of supporting handloom and Khadi, and I do propose to go to my hon. colleague the Finance Minister and ask him to increase my budget from Rs. 3½ to Rs. 5 Crores for handloom, and from Rs. 2 to Rs. 3 or Rs. 3½ Crores for Khadi for next year. So, the ceiling for our expenditure in regard to handloom and Khadi is not the amount of money that we get either by way of cess or by way of penal excise duty, but only what the total budget of the State can bear. So, I do not really put it exactly on all fours with what we get, and I do hope that we won't get any revenue

from the penal excise duty at all, that all the mills will play fair, that there will be only marginal adjustments where the penal duty would be levied, a small adjustment. We may get just Rs. 7 or Rs. 10 or Rs. 15 lakhs which is just a flea-bite. I am not hoping for any return on account of this duty because I am not hoping for there being a continuance of misbehaviour on the part of the mills. Nor do I want to make money in this way. I am merely wanting to use it as a check.

I think the House will forgive me, since I have generally dealt with the problems raised, if I do not reply to individual points raised by hon. Members, and I think they must be tired, but I can go on.

Some Hon. Members: No. no. Go on.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The only limiting factor is a hoarse throat, not facts that are before me.

One point was made by my hon. friend about those borders. Even Mr. Rajagopalachari has been speaking about bordered sarees and dhoties. Border is essential because border is still a very important factor so far as dhoties are concerned, but once you have no border or even you have a border which is indistinguishable, it is only necessary to prevent the cloth from tearing. A thick border is intended as a protection for the cloth from tearing. So that if you use the dhoti in the conventional style it will not tear. The border holds the cloth together. But in my part of the country, it is a habit for many to use *mulmuls*. The person who does not use a bordered dhoti does not go in for a dhoti with a border which is white, but he goes in for *mulmul* which is cheaper. It has been the habit long long ago, long before the handlooms had the monopoly of the market, when we were importing what we used to call '1703', and 'Glasgow-9000' *mulls*. I think, long before Shri S. V. Ramaswamy knew anything about the sartorial tastes

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

from people. I suppose he learnt it only after he became a Member of Parliament, and before that he did not mind what people did. The point really is that if anybody wants to switch over he can switch over, from using a white-bordered dhoti, because he can go to using *mulmul*. We are not preventing the mills from manufacturing *mulmul*. I can give the facts,—we have had an experience of about nine to ten months—in regard to this control order.

The deviations that have taken place by means of production of dhotis with a white border have been fractional, being roughly about 1½%. Surely, hon. Members do not want me to take this 1½% deviation as something serious, nor is it worth while for hon. Members to waste paper, pen and ink, in writing an amendment and asking me to accept it.

There is one other point, for which I would very humbly request the indulgence of the House. You, Sir, were speaking on this question of imports of cloth. I am not making a debating point of it but I am merely giving a piece of information. My hon. friend Shri Algu Rai Shastri also made that point. The one trouble about these imports is this. We have to export, because we have to import raw materials for our industries. And thanks to my hon. colleague here, we do not have to import very much of food,—but we may have to import some time later,—but we have to import machinery, so we have to have an export of roughly about 100/120 crores worth of cloth a year, which is the optimum. It is a little less now and we are not happy. What happens often is that countries which take our goods do not like the bans that we put on their goods. I have said in the House before that when I banned import of perfumes from France, they banned the import of sports goods from India, and I think we have lost roughly about a crore of rupees on

that account. Perhaps if I had allowed perfumes, I would have got about Rs. 10 lakhs or Rs. 5 lakhs worth of perfumes. I might say that we have devised another method of getting over these bans. Of course, we have the Tariff Commission, which gives protection to our industries and raises the duties, but administratively for revenue purposes, since we have to reduce the duties on raw materials and essentials like medicines, we have raised, in the last budget, the duties on very many articles which are semi-luxuries, and the duty on cloth, so far as preferential duties are concerned, went up from 31-1/4% to 66-2/3 per cent, and so far as non-preferential duties are concerned, to 100%. We do hope that this is an effective check on our consumers buying this cloth. In this connection, I shall give a few figures.

During the time when cloth was in the O.G.L.—i.e. anybody could import it—when the duty was 31½%, so far as preferential duty was concerned, we imported in 1948-49, Rs. 9 crores worth, and 47 million yards; in 1949-50, we imported Rs. 10 crores worth, and 73 million yards, but in 1952-53 we have imported Rs. 1.24 lakhs worth and 4½ million yards, and for six months in 1953, we have imported Rs. 41 lakhs worth, and roughly about 2 million yards.

Sir, I am merely putting to the House that we have a total export of 750 million yards out of which 300 million yards go to what are called Commonwealth countries. And 300 million yards mean roughly about 35 crores of rupees. Well, in all conscience, we must allow them to send here 40 lakhs of rupees worth of goods. Otherwise, we may lose a good portion of that 300 millions. That is the secret, Sir, of the import of cloth; not that I am fond of it. I can ban it, but if I ban it, I will also ban exports of cloth. If I ban exports, my power to buy raw materials for industry and capital goods for our needs and food, when it is necessary, will also be restricted. That is the

secreted of this thing. Not that I want foreign cloth. Why should we? we are producing 500 million yards so far as our mills are concerned and 1500 million yards so far as handlooms are concerned.

One other point that has been raised to which I would like to give an answer is this question: what is the position of handlooms today? Well, Sir, by any large, the position is not bad. (*Laughter from Opposition Benches*). Well, hon. Members in the Communist Group laugh and I do not mind their laughing, Sir, because it is good to see somebody laugh. We should not all have long faces, and when a Communist laughs it is a good thing, because he becomes an extrovert instead of being an introvert—which is what his dogma teaches him.

Sir, the position is that the quantity of yarn available has been progressively rising. In 1950 the quantity of yarn we made available to the handloom industry was 44,000 bales per month, and in 1951 it went up a little. Now the quantity that we are making available is over 70,000 bales per month. On the basis of conversion of that into cloth, it comes to somewhere about 1300 to 1500 million yards, and we are now producing about 1500 million yards. It may be that there are more handlooms than there were five years or three years back, but the fact really is that we have reached what was in former times the optimum level of production. And as I said, these 4000 bales of dhoties which are in short supply in Madras have to be made up by somebody and they are being made up by the handloom industry. It may be a laughing matter, but it is also a grim fact.

Sir, that more or less brings me to the end of my story. I will say once again that this is a very simple measure. It does not give away anything. It does not go very much beyond the control order. In any event, it does not take away the

538 PSD

powers that Government have arising out of that control order. We do hope that we would not be called upon to levy the penal excise duty beyond, say, 2 annas. That is, a 12½ per cent margin of production is necessary. Even there, we have allowed the calculation to be made on a quarterly basis so that there can be an adjustment. I have every hope, Sir, that the mill industry will play fair and will not pay us this money. If that happens, then we have done nothing wrong except to protect ourselves.

Shri Bhagwat Jha (*Purnea cum Santal Parganas*): May I seek a clarification from the hon. Minister? He said that it did not take away the powers of the Government. In view of the fact that this Bill will not have the power to touch those mills which have produced more, may I know what measures do Government contemplate to take against those mills who have already pocketed a heavy sum by breaking this order?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, Government have to keep their discretion. As Mr. Chatterjee asked me, I have gone into the question of the West Bengal Mills, and I find that in the case of three mills they are in a bad way. Two of them are refugee mills. One of them started late in 1952; so the quota system will not apply to that mill. The quota for the new mills has to be decided and some concession should be given to the refugee mills which were started after the relevant period. I am sure my hon. friend does not want me to be a Shylock and insist upon the pound of flesh.

Shri S. S. More: Sir, he is not addressing the Chair.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, the Chair hears it.

Shri S. S. More: I rise to a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: I think the hon. Minister was addressing the Chair; he was only facing that side. Otherwise he was addressing the Chair.

Shri S. S. More: I want a clarification, Sir. Is it enough that the Chair hears him and he can address anyone?

Shri G. H. Deshpande (Nasik-Central): Sir, I rise to a point of order. When the hon. Mr. More raised a point of order he did not address himself to the Chief; he was addressing the hon. Minister. He ought to have addressed facing the Chair.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair does not want that whenever Members speak they should always have their faces towards the Chair. Otherwise it will be very difficult for the members themselves to face other members and make an impression. They need not always look towards the Chair. All that is required is they must address the chair.

The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of an additional excise duty on dhoties issued out of mills in excess of the quota fixed for the purpose, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: Before I proceed with the clauses, I have to announce that tomorrow after the termination of the discussion on this Bill, the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill will be taken into consideration.

Clause 2 — (Definitions).

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy rose—

Mr. Chairman: Does he propose to move the amendment?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Not moving, Sir.

Shri Gopala Rao: I beg to move:

In page 1, line 13, after "contains" insert "or does not contain".

Sir, this is a simple amendment and I think no explanation is needed. As you know, Sir, in some of the States people wear dhoties without border.

That is why it will be a short coming if this is not amended in this Bill. The spirit of this amendment is to include dhoties even without borders. They must also come into the picture. I do not think the hon. Minister will oppose this.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have said, Sir, that we do not propose to include non-coloured borders. So, I am unable to accept this.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 1, line 13, after "contains" insert "or does not contain".

The motion was negatived.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I beg to move:

In page 1, line 13, for "yarn on its borders" substitute "or white yarn to indicate its borders".

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not accepting it; why do you want to move it?

Shri Sinhasan Singh: There may be reasons for your not accepting it. In your part, generally dhoties have coloured borders; but, in our parts we find dhoties which have no coloured borders. I am only putting the words, 'white yarn to indicate its borders'. It does not do any harm. If the production goes beyond the margin then only the question comes up. It only affects a part, 5 or 6 per cent. of dhoties with white yarn border. Why compare the whole country with one part of it. There cannot be any special objection to this; you need not compare it with *mulmul*. It is of a different texture. Both the textures cannot be mixed up. I would request him to accept this amendment because it is a harmless one.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have already said that there is only 1½% deviation

Mr. Chairman: The question is:—

In page 1, line 13, for "yarn on its borders" substitute "or white yarn to indicate its borders".

The motion was negatived.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): I beg to move:

In page 1, after line 13, insert:

"(iia) contains double yarn in the warp of the border;"

My contention, Sir, is that in dhoties, borders are indicated by giving double yarn in the warp. It may be that the mills will manufacture shirtings and thans with white borders without any coloured yarn. In that case the intention of the Bill will be frustrated. So I request that my amendment may be accepted.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am advised by my technical advisers that the contingency is not likely to happen. In any event I do not want to complicate the issue.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. Member wish to press his amendment?

Shri S. C. Samanta: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 1, after line 13, insert:

"(iia) contains double yarn in the warp of the border;"

The motion was negatived.

Shri Gopala Rao: I beg to move:

In page 1, after line 24, add:

"(e) the cases of the mills exclusively manufacturing dhoties should be considered on their merits for fixing up quotas and levying additional excise duty."

For the definition of "quota", a uniform basis should not be applied, because there are some mills exclusively producing dhoties and as such some discrimination must be

made. That is the spirit of my amendment.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: They need not come in the definition and they are provided in the subsequent clauses.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

In page 1, after line 24, add:

"(e) the cases of the mills exclusively manufacturing dhoties should be considered on their merits for fixing up quotas and levying additional excise duty."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—(Levy of Additional duty of excise on dhoties).

Shri Sinhasan Singh rose—

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I do not think his amendment is admissible. A fine means that you have got to levy a fine. We cannot levy a fine merely because in an enactment it should be specifically so provided: the persons concerned have got to go to the court and prove it. This is contrary to the principles of the Bill.

Shri Sinhasan Singh: I want a complete fine. This duty is in fact a fine. You have put it at 2 annas to 8 annas. I put it at 6 annas.

Mr. Chairman: The question is whether the levy of six annas per yard would not enhance the duty. It requires the recommendation of the President. I wanted to hear him on this point—if he has anything to say. Therefore, this amendment is not allowable.

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

*Clauses 5 and 6 were added to the
Bill.*

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

*The Title and the Enacting Formula
were added to the Bill.*

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

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL
OF STATES

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the
following message received from the
Secretary of the Council of States:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 97 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Employees' Provident Fund (Amendment) Bill, 1953, which has been passed as amended by the Council of States at its sitting held on the 24th November, 1953."

EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS
(AMENDMENT) BILL

Secretary: Sir, I lay the Employees' Provident Funds (Amendment) Bill, 1953, passed as amended by the Council of States on the Table of the House.

*The House then adjourned till Half
Past One of the Clock on Thursday,
the 26th November, 1953.*