

CALLING ATTENTION TO A
MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE

STRIKE IN INDIAN ALUMINIUM Co.,
LTD., ALWAYE

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): Sir, under Rule 216, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Labour to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

"The strike in the Indian Aluminium Co., Ltd., Alwaye, Travancore-Cochin."

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abid Ali): The Company paid a bonus of 10 per cent. of the gross earnings, in 1954, though it had sustained a loss. In 1955, the Workers' Union demanded 25 per cent. of the gross earnings as bonus for that year as the Company had made some profits. The Company pleaded inability to pay as it had to adjust a portion of the profit against heavy losses incurred in the past. On the intervention of the conciliation machinery, the Company agreed to pay up to 11½ per cent. that is 1½ per cent. more than what was paid as bonus in 1954. The offer was not acceptable to the Union. As no settlement could be effected, the State Government referred the dispute on the 2nd August, 1956, for adjudication. This was communicated to the parties.

While the dispute was pending before the Tribunal, the workers went on strike suddenly from 8 A.M. on 14th August, 1956. The plant in the Aluminium Factory is a continuous process plant and the sudden stoppage of work will involve considerable loss.

As the workers went on strike during the pendency of adjudication proceedings the strike is illegal under section 24(1) (i) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT
(AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Finance and Iron and Steel (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, be taken into consideration."

On Friday evening when I sought leave of this House to move the Bill, I made a statement indicating the reasons for Government imposing this taxation. In fact, though the statement was short, it covered more or less all aspects of the situation, and I do not think that at this stage there is any need for me to add very much to that statement. But because hon. Members would need some more factual information behind the action taken by the Government in this regard, it was felt that a note should be circulated, and I hope that every hon. Member has got the note which Parliament Secretariat was good enough to circulate last night. The note gives factual figures of the situation as it exists today. For the sake of those hon. Members who might not have had time to read the note, I would like to recapitulate the contents of the note here.

The three facts which have to be taken in considering a motion of this nature are that the consumption figures of cloth show sharp upward trend, that the demand for cloth is not met by the supply that is now available, and that, as a consequence, there is an increase in price. This is a factual appraisal of the situation that we have at present.

It is not necessary for me at this stage to go into the clauses of these facts coming into being. Some of it perhaps is due to the fact that we are following for various reasons, and good ones, a somewhat restrictive policy in regard to the development or expansion of the mill sector. Our doing so has yielded certain results which would be evident from the

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

figures that this note gives in respect of the need for increase in production in the handloom sector. We also anticipated a rise in the consumption of cloth as a result of the First Five Year Plan going through, but it seems that the consumption has got accelerated in a sense, and the rise is higher than what we anticipated. The production too that we have today is not flexible enough for us to meet a contingency of this nature. I think at an appropriate time the House will perhaps indicate its own views on this matter, and Government would be quite prepared to take steps to see that within a measurable distance of time we could avoid a contingency of this nature that is, we shall have an installed capacity which might or might not be used in the mill sector which would permit us to increase production when we need such increased production for consumption in the country.

The main point before us really is that with the upward trend in demand, we are expecting a sharp increase in prices as a result of the shortage of goods. The Puja demand is coming almost within the next few weeks. There will be the Diwali demand and in certain parts of India during the Sankranti also cloth is purchased, and advantage will certainly be taken of by the industry and trade to raise prices further than what they have been raised. We have, in the note, indicated the steady rise in prices—not often are these equated by the *pari passu* rise in the price of cotton.

If hon. members will look at the figures that I have given in regard to the increase in the price of medium cloth, they would find that the cotton mix price which has been indicated has been more or less steady practically from the beginning of the years. The facts therefore seem to be reasonably clear that there will be an increase in prices in the near future, and the only method normally open to us to meet that contingency is to increase supply. The fiscal resources

at our disposal, as I said before, do not permit us to bring into being a situation of this nature. Naturally, one has to adopt such fiscal measures as are available with a consciousness—and I might say in my case a deep consciousness—of the fact of the imperfection of those devices for achieving the ends that we have in view, so that we can to some extent restrict consumption, and where we cannot do it, to mop up some portion of the extra profits that are made by the trade and industry.

The measure before the House, if it is studied in all its aspects, will indicate that it is a deterrent measure, that Government have armed themselves or seek to arm themselves, subject to the approval of the two Houses of Parliament, with enough powers to see that if prices rise, there will be a simultaneous rise in the tax. The point hon. Members will have to remember is that it is not a *per se* taxation measure. Though our needs are great and may be we have to come before the House on a later occasion for taxation in this or other forms, at the present moment what is mainly intended is not to impose on the public a taxation measure by the tax device used for the purpose of attaining certain ends, which certainly is not very effective but nevertheless goes a long way to mitigating the situation.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam): What is the situation you want to mitigate?

Pandit S. C. Mishra (Monghyr North-East): Only to get money.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Hon. Members will note that we have taken power to raise the amount of tax. My hon. friend wants to know what is the situation that I want to mitigate. Unfortunately my expression is not equal to the clarity that my hon. friend has at his disposal. That is exactly what I have been saying all along, and the situation that I have to meet is a possible contingency of

shortage in cloth and an increase in prices. That is exactly what is sought to be done. The hon. Member might say, "What you do will not meet the situation". That is a matter of opinion. But the main purpose behind this measure today is to meet that situation, that is, a possible shortage in cloth and arrest, if not wholly at least to some extent, a possible increase in prices.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Do you want to stop the growth in consumption?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is so; my hon. friend sometimes hits upon the nail correctly. That is the whole idea.

Shri S. S. More: That is my virtue.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If consumption of cloth rises beyond the availability of cloth, then naturally inflationary trends gather momentum. Of course, we do not want consumption of cloth to be decreased if we have cloth to supply. But the limits to which we ought to permit consumption should have some relation to the limits to which we can afford supply. In the present case, consumption is out running supply. It is a simple economic fact which my hon. friend may laugh at, but it is nevertheless very grim and realistic, and we cannot escape from it. A higher price, whether the profits are made by the dealer or some portion of it is taken by the State, has certain effects when the prices reach, what is called in economic parlance, a stage when the law of diminishing returns operates, and the consumer says 'No'. If I am normally going to buy 20 yards this season, and if I buy only 18 yards, then the prices will come down. The demand will probably be either equated to supply or a little lower than the supply.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha (Patna East): What about Dussera and Puja. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister ought to be allowed to go on. I have noted the names of hon. Members who want to participate in this debate. Other hon. Members merely want to elucidate a particular point and they may kindly care to note down their point, and after the hon. Members finish, if I find that the points made are not sufficient, I shall allow one or two questions to be put.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: We had expected that the economic process will act and, as I said, when the prices rise beyond a particular level may be the consumption will drop. It is not a thing which is desirable, but in the present circumstances there is nothing else that can be done than hope that the consumption will be restricted. If we can persuade the people by propoganda, by telling them that if they go on buying now more than what is necessary they are merely allowing the dealer to raise the prices, we can do something to limit the purchases and it would be a good thing. But by a sort of complete control and rationing I do not think how it will be possible for us to keep down the prices at a particular level and not allow them to rise. I do not think normally Members of this House are prepared to have a thing of that nature because in the past our experience has been that the administration of control has not been either complete or perfect and it has led to a lot of abuse. So we are now really trying to use fiscal devices to inhibit consumption to some extent.

I would like to make it clear again that, while we would welcome all the money that would go into the treasury, we are certainly not imposing the tax with a view to augmenting the revenue but to mop up some portion of the increased profits that are being made. I do not want to tell the hon. Members that no portion of this tax will be passed on to the consumer, because I am not in a position to say very definitely that that would be so. I am perfectly certain, considering the experience in

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

the past, that as the price of cloth goes up and up the law of diminishing returns is attracted and progressively the question of passing it on would become more difficult. Therefore, while the tax increase is one anna, may be three pies would be passed on and nine pies will have to be absorbed so long as there is a cushion for absorbing, and it is not merely a question of the millowner taking the profit. So what we seek to do is just try to inhibit consumption at that level, at what you call the wholesaler or mill level. But in actual effect, so far as the retail prices are concerned, even today the gap between what you call the fair retail price and the retail price that obtains in a city like Delhi is very great. On Saturday we sent out somebody to make some purchases of those articles for which we have fair price figures. It is not that these things were arbitrarily chosen. We have some figures with us and I should like to give you some idea of the gap that exists today. That ex-mill price for Crown Mills Samrat Dhooties is Rs. 7-4-0; the fair retail price in Delhi, taking into account the wholesaler's and retailer's profit, cost of transport, sales-tax etc., would be Rs. 8-5-0 and the actual price in Delhi on Saturday was Rs. 10-8-0. Here the difference between the fair price which should normally be charged and the price actually charged is more than Rs. 2. It may be that in our working out the fair price one anna more should have been added or the price should be one anna less, but there is a very big difference in prices on a cloth like the fine dhotie. The same thing is there with regard to sarees. The India United Mills 50x71 sarees, medium, mill price is Rs. 6-13-3; fair price in Delhi would be about Rs. 7-13-3, but actually the price on Saturday was Rs. 9-0-0. Here it is a question of more than Rs. 1-2-0, being charged above the fair price. These can be multiplied. I have got about 9 items for which we got the prices, where actual purchases have been made by the office to find out the

exact prices. These purchases were not made at one of the small shops but some of the bigger shops. Therefore, hon. Members will notice that even now the figures that we have given in this not as fair ex-mill prices or wholesale prices are not in reality obtained in the city. There is a very big gap even as it is.

Therefore, to say that a mere addition of an anna or half anna would immediately attract the attention of these people and they will raise it to that extent is not correct. It may be that they will raise it more; may be, if shortage is greater for some reason or other—there are pockets where there is acute scarcity—it will be raised much more. But is not a matter of cause and effect and, at the present moment, we still think that this tax will have an inhibitory effect.

I would like to underline once again the fact that the nature of the tax device contemplated in this particular measure is such that we can raise it further, and the fact that we can raise it further ought to prove a deterrent. It may be that other methods might be suggested by hon. Members in the course of the discussion which would help us to make the purchaser a little more price conscious and thereby, perhaps, inhibit consumption to some extent for the time being. Whatever we do today to increase consumption would take a matter of about a year or little more to produce results. Supposing we do feel that we should increase the production of yarn or even allow a small increase in the loomage, it will take certainly a year. The licences we have given for spinning mills, which we are threatening to cancel if they do not get into production within the stated period, will start functioning within about 12 months. That will increase our yarn supply and to that extent it may increase the supply to the handloom weaver. Hon. Members will have found that production in the handloom

sector has increased perceptibly, because in the half year in 1956 the production is about 800 million yarns as against 1400 million in 1955, and may be that by next year even that sector could have more yarn and we can perhaps increase the loomage to some extent. But we have to make provision between now and, say, 8 to 12 months, where certain conditions would be obtained by which we will not be able to increase the supply in any adequate measure.

Those are the reasons, perhaps, to put before this House a Bill of this nature, I would like to say once again, with certain powers which look like omnibus powers but which are necessary for the Government if they have to use these powers adequately and well at the time when prices show an indication to go up.

Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda): Sir, as a layman I would like to ask, when this race in raising of prices and sharing of profits stop? What would happen to the poor consumer?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, if more questions are asked like this I will try and endeavour to reply them.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): Sir, when this Bill was introduced; we had said that we should have time to look into the nature of the Bill before we could say as to how many hours this Bill would take. At that time it was stated that two hours would be given and at your discretion more time will be allowed. In the bulletin I find that this has been added: "subject to a limit of one hour". It means that we will have only a maximum of 3 hours. This is a very debatable Bill and it raises fundamental issues as to the nature of the economic policy pursued etc. I would therefore submit that we should have some more time for this Bill. I think at least a full day should be given for discussion on a Bill of this type.

Shri S. S. More: Sir, I also support the submission which has been made by my friend Shrimati Renu

Chakravarty. This Bill comes in a very simple and innocuous form, but basically we will have to go into what are the essentials of our economic policy and how far we are going to protect the much harassed consumer. Now, an attempt is being made by the Government on the pretext of mopping up extra profits earned. But from that point of view many of us will have to make our own contribution. We represent so many constituencies and on the eve of the elections I think that sort of free expression will serve its own purpose from many points of view. I would request you to at least allow one day for discussion on this Bill which is of a very social nature.

Mr. Speaker: I will first place the motion before the House.

Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, be taken into consideration".

We have at present allotted two hours for this Bill, subject to its being increased by one hour. Let me find out how many hon. Members want to take part in this. It is a technical one. Generally the consumer is hit, otherwise the economic and financial points are involved in this. The implications are that it is a technical one. Anyhow, we will watch the progress and decide, say, at the end of two or three hours, how long we will have to sit in regard to this matter. There is no intention to hustle. But sometimes, the whole thing collapses very soon.

Now, 15 minutes will be allowed for each hon. Member and 20 minutes for leaders of groups.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): Before this Bill was introduced, I was in Bombay and Nagpur, and at both the places, I was surprised to find that the interested quarters already knew that such a measure was going to be introduced in Parliament. Those in Bombay and in Nagpur, from the millowners' quarters as well as from

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

the quarters of wholesalers, have had clear indications that such a measure was going to be introduced in Parliament. So, on this question also, as in some other questions, it is seen that the businessmen and industrialists are able to have information before-hand. Whether this is a kind of leakage or whether it is accidental or whether there are certain pipe-lines through which this information goes to interested quarters, is a matter which the Minister should look into. This thing has been happening over and over again. It was admitted on the last occasion that even when life insurance was nationalised, the information had gone out. I shall not labour this point further, but I do not think it brings any credit to a Government that measures of this nature should be bruited about, before they are introduced in Parliament, in the Market-places of our country.

I find it difficult to understand the purpose behind this measure. Either the confusion is in my mind or the confusion is in the mind of the Finance Minister. But there is confusion somewhere. What is the purpose of this measure? Is the purpose to mop up profits of the manufacturers? Is it the purpose to mop up the surplus profits of the wholesalers as suggested in the Statement of Objects and Reasons? Is the purpose to mop up the surplus purchasing power that is today circulating among the consumers? Is it the idea that we should devise measures against possible shortage of cloth? Is it the idea to curtail consumption? What exactly is the purpose of this measure?

An Hon. Member: All.

Shri Asoka Mehta: If it is 'all', let us consider and see whether these purposes are being served by this measure or additional measures are needed. Surely, I had expected that the Finance Minister would give us a little more insight rather than merely list these purposes and tell us how

each one of these purposes is going to be served.

I am afraid that the Finance Minister has not given us—at least to my mind—any illuminating picture. It is true that there has been an increase in consumption of cloth and that increase seems to be outpacing the increase in production of cloth. The result has been that there is a decrease or fall in export and there is an increase in prices. What is the intention? Is it the intention that the expanding consumption of cloth should be halted? Is the excise duty being levied or are these duties being levied to act as a brake, or, is a further rise in prices desired so that there might be a check on the growing consumption of cloth? If that is so, that should be clearly stated. Is this one of the measures whereby the surplus purchasing power in the hands of the consumers going to be taken away? On more than one occasion, I have argued in favour of such a policy, for the very simple reason that you cannot have the development of an economy unless and until you are willing it simultaneously to restrain consumption. Is this the measure in that direction? If this is a measure in that direction, it has to be judged on its merits. Or, is it the idea that this is merely going to take away the surplus profits whether they are of the wholesalers or of the manufacturers? That point needs to be made clear and it has not been made clear.

Secondly, as the Finance Minister pointed out, the excise duties that are being levied are likely to be passed on, only in part, to the consumers. In the past, I believe, the excise duties were passed on in that fashion. There is a sellers' market now, and the City Notes of the *Times of India* pointed out on the 1st September that there is a general feeling that with the current sellers' market in cloth, there is a spate of increase, and the excise duty will descend heavily on the consumers instead of mopping up part of the mill profits. So, so

long as the sellers' market exists, there is the possibility of excise duties being passed on to the consumers. The elasticity of demand for cloth being what it is, there is every likelihood of the price of cloth rising in the near future as a result of the measure that has been placed before us. This might result in slowing down the demand for cloth. If the demand slows down, I do not know whether it will make it possible for us to increase our export or whether it will slow down our export, because you are ultimately raising the prices to a level where it may not be possible for people to go and buy as much cloth as they would like to. Whether this will help the exports in any fashion, I do not know, and that again has not been explained by the Finance Minister.

It should be made clear to us whether we want to curtail the consumption of cloth and whether that is the reason why we are raising the prices, because, I hear various suggestions being made. Some people come forward and say that we should have fair price shops. Others come and say that there should be some kind of price control. If the idea is to increase the consumption of cloth, we have reached a certain level, and in the four or five years' time that has passed, we seem to have regained the lost ground. Do we now move forward? Because, the Finance Minister says that the intention is to increase loomage, and for a larger capacity for producing textiles, we will have to increase the loomage and that we shall be able to expand our capacity in a year's time. Does it mean, therefore, that we want to increase the per capita consumption of cloth during the second Five Year Plan period? By how much do you want to increase it? If you are going to increase it to a certain extent, what will be the general effect, the total effect, upon the savings that you want to raise for the purposes of development of our economy. This inter-relationship between the various factors and sectors has got to be

worked out, which unfortunately has not been worked out.

We have never been bold. Sometimes, it is suggested that every effort is being made to increase cloth production so that people may have enough cloth. Then, suddenly we are told, "Oh, production is not enough; we have got to control consumption". Surely, if the intention was to increase consumption, production should have been planned before-hand. But I believe that the intention is not to increase consumption beyond a particular limit. If that is so, there is no question than of increasing production beyond that limit. You have to take measures whereby consumption will be restrained to that limit. The time has come up, if this is the policy, to communicate to the people that "this is the policy and that in order to restrain consumption at that level, prices will be raised". On that point, I believe we would give up the habit of running with the hare and hunting with the hound and make a clear and categorical policy statement.

Then, we are told that this measure is being introduced in order to mop up the surplus profits. These duties are expected to yield about Rs. 17.5 crores. I would have liked to know from the Finance Minister as to what has been the profits of the textile industry. Is the textile industry in a position to pay Rs. 17.5 crores out of the profits?

1 P.M.

I have not been able to work it out more fully; perhaps, the Minister can tell us more about it. But, it means that there will be taxation to the tune of about Rs. 2 lakhs a month on every mill having a thousand looms. Is it possible for a mill having a thousand mills today to contribute in terms of taxes Rs. 24 lakhs a year? If they have been getting higher profits, let us be told about it. We do not know what the profits of the textile industry are today, to what extent their profits have increased in the past few months and to what

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

extent these excise duties will be passed on to the manufacturers. We do not know whether this kind of excise duties will not result in making it more difficult for the marginal mills to function, while permitting the better-placed mills to continue to make surplus profits that they have been enjoying so far. This policy of excise duty might mean that the marginal mills are pushed to the walls, while the better off mills continue to make surplus profits. What is the Finance Minister's solution to this kind of a difficult situation that might arise tomorrow, assuming that the excise duties are passed on to the manufacturers? Here again, we do not know what his views on the subject are.

This particular Bill was introduced by the present Finance Minister when he was the Minister of Commerce and Industry. I do not know; perhaps it was in his capacity as Commerce and Industry Minister that he had sponsored this Bill. In the meantime he has been metamorphosed in to the position of the Finance Minister and, therefore, I would like to know from him..... If the Labour Minister would be kind enough to let me have his ear, what I would like to know from him is, is this an isolated thing or has he any kind of an anti-inflation policy and if so, what is this anti-inflation policy? He said, profits are rising; is it with the wholesalers or with the manufacturers? Is this rise in profits confined only to textile manufacturers or have profits increased similarly as far as other manufacturers also are concerned? I have been going round the country meeting businessmen and manufacturers and I have been told that never before they have enjoyed a year which has been as prosperous as last year. The businessmen have found that in the last twelve months they have minted profits, the like of which was never witnessed before. If such large profits are made, what are the measures being suggested to mop up the surplus profits? He himself did not know whether these excise duties would mop up the profits of the

wholesalers or the manufacturers, wholly or partly, and if partly, in what proportion; how much it will amount to, what is the elasticity; to what extent consumption is likely to be restrained by the rise in prices etc. These are matters about which he has given us no information. If the Finance Minister is primarily concerned about mopping surplus profits and if his idea is not to restrict consumption in the country, he could have come forward with a measure like the Excess Profits Act. Why does he merely come forward with a measure increasing the excise duties, which might result in putting more burdens upon consumers? I am in favour of more burdens being put on the consumers—there may be many Members who may not like to say it publicly and take the consequences—but I am prepared to say...

Shri S. S. More: You are courageous.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I am prepared to say publicly that I am in favour of more burdens being put on the consumers when I am assured that profits will be mopped up. I have said over and over again that unless you are prepared to mop up the surplus profits, you have no right—moral, political or any kind of right—to put a fresh burden upon our people. No people can develop, unless the people are prepared to shoulder new burdens, but no Government and no Parliament has a right to put these burdens upon the common people, unless the surplus profits are fully and adequately taxed.

What happens in a developing economy? It is a very simple thing that in a developing economy, particularly one which is operated by deficit financing, the share of the profits of manufacturers and big businessmen rises disproportionately. It is bound to happen; it is inevitable. Under the circumstances, the logical and just policy is that those profits should be taxed away. But, there is no capital gains tax and no excess profits tax. We are merely told that

we are going to have excise duties on cloth. As I said, such excise duties might be necessary, because we cannot permit, if we want to develop our economy side by side, our consumption to go on increasing rapidly. A check on consumption is necessary to divert resources for purposes of development of our economy. But, this is putting the cart before the horse. I can understand the Commerce and Industry Minister coming to us and saying, "This is all what I can do; I am not the Finance Minister. I can bring before you only this measure". Fortunately, now he is the Finance Minister, I do not want him to tell me just now what measures he proposes to bring; but surely, we are entitled to know whether this is part of an anti-inflation policy. We are entitled to know whether this mopping up of surplus resources in the country and use them for development purposes—particularly the surplus profits that are being made by the privileged few in the country—is part of an anti-inflation policy or this is an isolated Bill. If this is a part of a general strategy of controlling inflation in the country and sucking away from our economy the surplus profits that are being made, I would be in favour of supporting such a measure. But, if this is an isolated and limited measure that is being taken, I will be constrained to oppose it, because this would not be fair to the consumers. This would not be fair to the common people, when you are ignoring and completely by-passing the money-makers with their expanding profits.

An Hon. Member: Your words do not convey any meaning.

Shri Asoka Mehta: Whether my words convey any meaning to you or not, I have made my position very clear. If this measure is going to be part and parcel of a general strategy for controlling inflation in the country, which means having excess profits tax, capital gains tax and other taxes on mounting profits in the country, I will accept it. But, if it is an isolated Bill, as it appears to be, introduced by the Commerce and

Industry Minister having no relation whatsoever to an integrated policy of dovetailing our fiscal policy with our planned economy, I am afraid no sensible person would be in a position to support such a measure.

I hope the Finance Minister and his colleagues will take this opportunity to explain to the people what their policy is, not short-term policy but long-term policy, and not go about talking vaguely, saying "we are going to increase production; we want to restrain consumption" and so on. These are issues that need to be carefully gone into. That a certain amount of elasticity has been provided for in this measure and that the Government would be able to make use of such an elasticity as the situation changes from time to time is a desirable feature of the Bill. But, our exports are going down. By passing this measure, how are our exports going to be stepped up? There again nothing definite has been told to us. I, therefore, find that it is difficult for a person like me to pronounce any kind of precise opinion on a measure like this, until fuller information is given to us.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]
1.9 P. M.

I had hoped that the Finance Minister would make it possible for us, in the light of the observations he would make while introducing this measure, to say yes or no to this measure; but unfortunately, he has tried to remain in the realm of vagueness. I hope at least before we are asked to vote upon the Bill, he will get down from the realm of vagueness that he has deliberately imposed on himself.

Dr. Krishnaswami (Kancheepuram): We must be thankful to the Finance Minister for having hinted obliquely at a consideration which influenced him in introducing this measure. He suggested that it was necessary to restrict consumption of goods in the present state of inflationary expenditures embarked upon by the Government.

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

I should like, however, to examine the statistical data presented to the House in the Statement of Objects and Reasons and which have been expanded at length in the note on supply and price trends of cloth by the Finance Ministry. I find it difficult, to deduce from the data any convincing argument for the proposed excise duty on cloth. The table detailing the price of cloth in money terms is meant to convey the impression that the rise in prices has been continuous and substantial. This conclusion is unwarranted for several reasons. For instance, in the case of coarse cloth, prices rose in March, April and May but actually declined in June. In the case of medium cloth, though it increased in March, April and May, it was stabilised in June. In the case of fine cloth, the rise was concentrated in March, April and May and a slight decline was registered in June. Another important factor is that coarse and medium cloth mixture price did not rise during this period at all while in the case of fine and superfine cloth the mixture price rose by four annas and seven annas. I suggest that one of the explanations for the price rise during these months, March, April and May, is to be found in the decision of Parliament to introduce excise duties on cloth in that period. Of course there were other influences at work. We know, for instance, that effective demand tended to outstrip supplies that were available in the market and this in itself tended to bring about a greater increase in prices and consequently of profits.

Much has been made of the Tariff Commission's recommendations; it is clear that all that this body suggested was that so long as normal demand and normal supply conditions ruled the market a certain rate of profit was reasonable and that this profit could be worked out. But since effective demand has tended to outstrip supplies, the profits in this industry have become abnormal; this at any rate, seems to be in conformity with com-

monsense and we need not have recourse to statistical data which are ambiguous and which cannot be expected to separate this factor from other factors.

But there is one question which requires an answer. Are these excise duties an expedient to mop up the extra profits? Surely, if extra profits are to be mopped up, these excise duties are not the best expedient or even the second best expedient. These profits can be mopped up by direct taxation. But if profits are abnormal in one industry the proper device for bringing them down is to provide for the entry of new firms into the industry, thus helping to increase supplies and competition which in its wake will help to bring down prices. Excise duties on cloth, particularly in the case of medium cloth which represents seventy per cent. of the cloth consumed by the community, will lead to a rise in the price of cloth to the full extent of the duties levied. Let us remember that in the sellers' market of today it is the consumer that will have to pay the whole duty. No extra profits will be mopped up by this measure. So, let us not try to deceive ourselves by assuming that we are going to mop up extra profits by this measure. Let us be clear in our own minds, let us be intellectually honest and tell the community that we have to levy this excise duty, not to mop up profits, but because we want to collect revenue, because we want to make cloth dearer to the consumer so that the pressure on supplies might be mitigated at least temporarily. We may even make hand-spun and handloom a little less disadvantageous to the consumer by this sort of taxation, but surely this is different from mopping up profits. In this connection one cannot understand why the Government want to have more flexible powers for increasing excise taxes. Surely, if extra profits are not to be mopped up by this measure, there is no justification for the Government

taking up blanket powers to increase the excise duties up to four annas or six annas per sq. yd. Let them come each time to Parliament and justify the rise in excise duties. Let us be asked to approve afresh a rise in excise duties. You want to have this blanket power because you wish at your sweet pleasure to have the consumer burdened, because you wish to make cloth dearer to the consumer. A major political party, once it makes a decision of this nature, must have the courage to go to the country and point out that such taxes are necessary in the interests of development. I do not think that the present rate of excise duties levied is justifiable. Personally I should have wished that the rate had been increased by 50 per cent. in the case of medium cloth, if Parliament wanted an increase in excise duty, on cloth.

Now I shall deal with the other major issue and which, I think, has been touched upon by the hon. Finance Minister in his speech. He pointed out that the supplies were restricted and that we ought to devote some thought towards increasing supplies since without increasing them it would not be possible to meet the ever rising demand. I think the time has come when we should revise our ideas of plans. The hon. Finance Minister, in his speech pointed out that so far as the First Five Year Plan was concerned, the effective demand for cotton tended to outstrip the supplies available. What happened was that we had planned for an increase of 11 per cent. in our national income but, as events turned out, we had an increase of 18 per cent. or thereabouts and the targets that we had fixed, even though they were increased to a certain extent, were not sufficient to cope with the increased demand consequent on a rise in our incomes. What is it that we have to do? May I point out that if we are to mop up the abnormal profits that are in evidence in any particular industry, we ought to make conditions of entry into that industry as easy and as flexible as possible so

that we might have increased supplies of commodities, so that we might be in a position to bring the profits down to a normal level. But all the arguments that are employed—and particularly the arguments that have been employed in introducing this Bill—reflect the confusion on what should or should not be done by those in authority. It is absolutely necessary that if today we wish to increase the supplies—and while nobody seems to contest that proposition those in authority apparently are not giving any thought to the way in which the events are shaping in our economy—we should, as an immediate start, attempt to make uneconomic mills more economic by increasing facilities for their securing looms and having a proper spindle capacity. Also, we have to revise the ceiling on production of textiles. I quite agree that it would take some time between the revision of the ceilings and the installation of new mills. But this, let us realise, is something which we ought to do as quickly as possible.

The hon. Finance Minister only about a week ago was in charge of the Industries Department of the Government of India and he ought to realise more clearly than any other member of this House that the expenditure by the public sector is concentrated precisely in industries like iron and steel which produces non-wage goods; therefore, the amount of income which flows into the hands of those employed will be spent on wage-goods. If they are to be spent on wage goods, unless we are able to increase the supply of wage goods, any increase in excise duties, any amount of price control will not do the trick of keeping prices in check. So, let us face this basic fact and let us attempt to revise our ideological fads. I may also point out that if we are going to think of increasing the capacity of mills, we should also give some thought to our having multiple shifts in our mills and giving special tax allowances for depreciation purposes, in view of the increased wear and tear to which machines would be subjected to. But one thing which

[Dr. Krishnaswami]

troubles me is that we have not as yet understood the dangers of taxing only one commodity, and one particular industry. The time has come when Parliament should search its heart and find out whether this sort of taxation is going to do any good to our country. We have taken up one particular commodity and one particular industry for levying burdens. We are making the consumers of the commodity of particular industry pay heavily. It is a matter of common knowledge that the world's biggest textile industry is situate in India. What do we visualise it to be in the future? We should attempt, according to well known economists who have given some thought to this matter, to at least increase its capacity so that its size is comparable to that found in three or four major countries specialising in textiles. This at any rate, would give us greater opportunities for increasing the per capita consumption of cloth at the same time in our country; we can make provision for our developing trade in other regions of the world. Today, however, we are doing everything in our power to create an environment in which the textile industry should not develop at a normal rate. By all means, let us develop our handloom industries. It is but right that they should be developed. But, they have a place. They would be assured of an increased market by the very growth of income in non-wage goods industries and other schemes of assistance that we have envisaged. I agree that in any period of development, particularly with deficit financing, one of the main considerations which should motivate a Finance Minister in suggesting schemes of taxation is the need to increase the amount of public savings that would be available to the exchequer. From that point of view, any increase in taxation of the consumer and the various commodities would be welcome. But, let us also realise that if we indulge in an orgy of increases in excise duties and taxes without taking into account

the repercussions on the cost of living, what we have gained in the shape of public savings might be lost in meeting the demand for increased wages. What has struck me as odd is that we speak in one breath of making the consumer pay and yet are willing to speak in another breath of making cloth cheap. We are still unable to revise our ideological prejudices. Excise duties and commodity taxes are a recognised expedient for raising revenues and, provided they are broad-based, there is little likelihood of the cost of living mounting up appreciably.

I want to bring an example to the notice of my hon. friends. The price index of salt today is the same as it was in 1939. The price indices of all other commodities have increased four-fold or five-fold. A fifty per cent. increase in the price of salt would not in the least affect our economy. We would certainly have the much-needed funds, the much-needed public savings flowing into the exchequer.

• The second aspect of our policy which requires revision and to which I should like to make a brief reference is prohibition. Even here, it is a case of priorities which we have to take into account. In the present circumstances, when resources are needed for an expanding educational programme, if we wish to control the inflationary upsurge, if we wish to embark on a system of taxation which exploits taxation of commodities, it may be necessary to call halt to this policy of prohibition. But, let me, however take up one principal aspect of taxation of commodities. I do think that when we are considering any increase in excise duties, Parliament should be given an opportunity every time there is an increase to debate it thoroughly. It is well known and it is realised that excise duties generally are paid by the consumer. In the present circumstances of a sellers' market, it is the consumer that will have to pay in full. If we are going to make the consumer pay, it is

but right and proper that Parliament should discuss in full the implications of such a policy instead of giving the exchequer the power to have the duty raised up to a maximum of four annas and six annas. I know and realise that Parliament has ultimately the authority of reviewing any policy. But, it is one thing for the executive to come before Parliament ask for an increase and justify such an increase; it is another matter for Parliament to review it. I feel that in matters of taxation especially when we are thinking of anti-inflationary measures, we have to consider these schemes of taxation as a whole. It is perfectly true that a taxation of wealth or a capital gains tax can be resorted to by the exchequer. No one suggests that the Finance Minister has ruled out these expedients. But, I do suggest that when we are thinking of excise duties, we should take care to have these excise duties broad-based, covering as many commodities as possible; at the same time, we should consider relaxing the artificial restraints which have prevented the growth of the textile industry and which have created an environment in which the largest industry of the world in textiles finds itself handicapped to meet the needs of the community. I do feel that the other aspects of how we are to control profits of the mill-owners can be taken care of, by resorting to other weapons in our fiscal armoury. But, the fact that we are increasing the price of medium cloth, by the full amount of the tax is a matter which should certainly cause a great deal of searching of heart, and lead to a clearing of the confusion which has bogged our steps until now.

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this is the first time that I am speaking after Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has taken charge of the portfolio of Finance. I convey to him my hearty congratulations on his elevation. I would not like, by what I have to say about his first heroic debut in the form of this measure, to detract from my very sincere and

good wishes for a successful career in this Ministry.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): On a point of order, Sir.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: One of the hon. Members must resume his seat.

Shri S. S. More: Let us hear the point of order.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Are Members of this House entitled or are they within their rights when they get up on the floor of the House and offer their congratulations in a personal capacity to any Minister?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No point of order. They are justified.

Shri Bansal: The operative part of the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill is:

"It is necessary to mop off these extra profits."

On page 2 of this statement is given a table where month by month figures have been given of cloth and cotton prices. I would not like to go behind these figures. I do not know from where these figures have been called out and what is their authenticity. Because, when I compared these figures with certain other published data that I have, I find some differences. As however these figures are before us, I would like to deal with these only. In the last column where the prices of superfine cloth are given, I find that there is an increase of 16.2 per cent. in June over the figure of January. But the cotton mix price has gone up by 17.4 per cent. Even on this basis it is clear that there are no extra profits. At least, there is no increase in price. But, in the case of fine cloth, the price has gone up by 27.7 per cent. and that of cotton mix by 11.3 per cent. In this case, there is a definite lag. But what I would like to know is whether it is not a fact that during the last few months, costs have been consistently increased by deliberate Governmental policy. I would give you one example. The price of coal has gone up by about

[Shri Bansal]

25 per cent during the last year. Now, coal is quite an important commodity in the running of a cotton mill which must have some effect on the price of cloth. Then there are some other factors. For example, a large number of mills now are working three shifts. I have these figures with me. When you work three shifts, you work only for 6½ hours, with the result that if a mill works three shifts there is bound to be some rise in the cost. There has already been an increase of 6½ per cent. in transport charges. I, therefore, cannot get away from the conclusion that this table and this operative sentence in the Statement of Objects and Reasons are based on the theory of *suppressio veri*. You suppress the real facts and emphasize some other facts. I would have wished the Finance Minister to come forward with some more cogent arguments which I am sure he would have been able to muster with all his resources and his wisdom. But unfortunately from what we have got in the form of this Statement of Objects and Reasons and also the table that has been supplied to us, I am not able to get any convincing argument for proceeding with this Bill.

What are the increases that we are envisaging under this Bill? In the superfine variety where there has been no relative price increase of cloth, the effective increase will be 80 per cent. In the case of fine it will be 71·4 per cent.—I am talking of the excise duty—and in the case of medium it will be 100 per cent. This is not all. Government have taken power to increase these duties, the effect of which will be an increase of 140 per cent. in the case of superfine, about 242½ per cent. in the case of fine and 300 per cent. in the case of medium. The Finance Minister may say that this is only the power that we have taken and that it will be utilised when prices show signs of rising further, but I would suggest to him very humbly, and I think he will give some thought to this, that

whenever the trade knows that this is the ultimate duty which it may have to pay any time, then on those varieties which are in short supply most of this entire charge will be passed on to the consumer, and I do not know why this fact has not been taken into consideration while Government propose to take power to increase these duties to such an extent.

Then, perhaps sometimes percentages belie actual facts. I will give you one example. Take the case of a medium variety of dhoti coming from Gwalior or some of the mills here which are worn normally by the poorer sections of the community. One pair of dhotis, I am told, costs about Rs. 4-9-0 ex-mill. A duty on that of two annas which is being charged will mean about Rs. 1-9-0 because a pair of dhotis is ten yards and by square yards it amounts to 12½ yards. So, the duty alone, if it is levied at the rate which we are being asked to pass now, will be Rs. 1-9-0. Add to that the sales tax which in some States is one anna per rupee. Then you find six or seven annas more will be added, but if you calculate the duty at the rate of four annas per square yard then you will find that there will be an increase of 100 per cent. on the ex-mill price of certain varieties of cloth. I do not know whether it is the intention of Government to tax the consumer of cloth of a particular variety to such an extent.

Another thing to which I wish to draw the attention of the hon. House is that an impression is sought to be created that the rises on coarse varieties and coarse dhotis and sarees is very nominal. But what is the production of coarse varieties in the country? Only eleven per cent. Coarse dhotis form only 2½ per cent. of the entire production of dhotis in the country and coarse sarees less than half per cent. And then out of this eleven per cent. of coarse varieties I think seven or eight per cent. is tapestry, towelling and things which

are not used by the common man, and yet looking cursorily at this table one would feel that Government has exempted the coarser varieties and therefore the poor man is not being taxed as perhaps the richer man. But the consumption in the country of textiles is mainly of medium varieties because they account for about 74 or 75 per cent. of our total production, and it is here that the levy is being sought to be raised from one anna to four annas, at least power is being taken to do that, and I have just now tried to impress upon the House what will be the incidence of this very penal rate of duty.

I do think that if we are having deficit financing of the order that we have decided upon in the Five Year Plan it is but natural for Government to try to mop up some of the extra purchasing power. That is common ground and no one will disagree on that. Even the Taxation Enquiry Commission said that in our country, placed as we are in the light of our development plans, the essentials of life will have to be taxed, but here the main purpose is not to tax the essential supply. Here the main purpose is made out to be to mop up the extra profits which as I have tried to show are perhaps not there.

But in the case of a commodity like cloth, what is the difficulty? Are we not facing a situation where Government by their own action are creating a position in which we find that production is not being allowed to increase and at the same time demand is increasing? Whenever you pump money of this order into the system, demand is bound to increase not only of cloth, but of other commodities also, and instead of taking any steps to increase the production of cloth in order to match the demand, on the one hand we take a step by which we see that the production of cloth does not increase and on the other we try to see that the demand goes down. If this is the new trend of thinking, then I would like to know, as my friend Shri Asoka

Mehta wanted to know, as to what are the plans of Government. In the Five Year Plan there is mention of the philosophy of the whole plan, and it is said:

"To offset inflationary pressures associated with the period of rapid development, it is imperative that the targets of agricultural production proposed in the Plan should be further improved upon. At each stage adequate supplies of food and cloth and of essential consumer goods will have to be provided at reasonable prices and a careful watch on the working of the national economy maintained."

Hardly three or four months have gone since this Plan was presented to this House and we find the Finance Minister coming before the House and saying now that he will reverse the entire policy which was adumbrated in the Plan and see that the demand for cloth does not increase.

The present incumbent of the Finance Ministry when he was Commerce Minister in this very House on 16th April made a speech which was very widely commented upon in the press at that time. I would quote two or three sentences from his speech. In order to be fair to him, I am quoting him fully. He said:

"And while I am a firm believer that physical controls are an essential part of economic planning, we cannot in the name of planning ask our people whose living standards are notoriously low to postpone consumption for an indefinite period of time."

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Indefinite period of time.

Shri Bansal: But you have not told us as to how you are going to increase production even in that indefinite period of time, whatever that might mean:

"How can all these factors be divorced from our fiscal policy, our monetary policy, our policy

[Shri Bansal]

in regard to investment and our policy in regard to other matters of an administrative character which have a bearing on all these matters? If we undertake reform in any part of this at one time without thinking of its effect on the economic structure as a whole, our work becomes amateurish and perfunctory."

And it is exactly what he is doing. He is not thinking at one time of the whole structure, but is thinking in a very amateurish and perfunctory manner. And that is proved by the fact that no sooner does he join the Finance Ministry, than he comes with a measure.....

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: He becomes amateurish and does everything in a perfunctory manner.

Shri Bansal:.....which seeks to place such a huge burden on the consumers of cloth.

I would frankly have had no objection, if this measure had come, about four or five months earlier, and I shall give you my reasons for that. At that time, the price index in our country was roundabout 380 or so. Now, there is a consistent upward trend in our price index, and last week, it was 421. When the price trend is rising so consistently, is it right for the Finance Minister to come with a measure which will give a further spurt to that price trend? Now, whom will this affect? The other day, the Food and Agriculture Minister pointed out that Government were taking concerted action to bring down food prices; he even suggested that as a result of the action that they were going to take, there might be a crash in the market. On the one hand, you want the agricultural prices to crash. On the other, you want that the agriculturist should pay more on one commodity which he uses most, next to food.

There has been a lot of discussion in this House and outside on the rising trend of prices. While, no doubt,

the prices of foodstuffs have shown a tendency to rise, I was disposed to agree with the Food Minister, when he said that to some extent, that rise was a corrective one, because even now our food index is 397 as against 417 for all the groups of commodities—I am talking of the week ending 11th August, 1956. How can this measure be justified, which seeks to put up the price of an essential consumer article of the agriculturist, the price of whose main product it is your definite policy to reduce? I want to know what your policy is in regard to the price parity, and giving of impetus to the agriculturist to increase the production of agricultural products. And how does it fit in the whole matrix of our Plan?

Our Plan is based, I should think, on the idea that the price index will be roundabout 375 to 400. If Government have not entered into any detailed discussion as to what should be the price level in the country during the period of the Plan, I think it is now for the Finance Minister to give his thought to this one subject of paramount importance, this underlying question as to the level at which he wants the prices to be stabilised. If, by very deliberative policies, we go on increasing our costs, and therefore, the prices, what will be the total impact on our Plan? In spite of the fact that we may be keeping the total size of the Plan outwardly at the same figure, will we not really be reducing it by the percentage by which the price index rises? Now that the Minister is in a position to formulate the economic policies of Government, in this very vital matter, I would have liked that before he came in such a hurried fashion before the House with this Bill, he ought to have come to us with a detailed philosophy of his ideas of the Plan.

We had some inkling from the speech of the Minister, from which I have quoted just a little while ago. I must say that I got some kind of a shock, when I found that he had at least in effect gone back on the

cherished notions which he had propounded in this speech. But what I would impress upon him now is that since the making of the economic policies is in his hands, let him sit down, not in a hurry, but patiently, deliberately.....

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna):
Consciously:

Shri Bansal:.....and consciously also.....

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: He is unconsciously today?

Shri Bansal:and take this House into confidence as to what his idea is about the price level, how he wants to maintain stability in the prices, how he wants to maintain price parities for different articles of consumption, and in what manner he wants the Plan to be fulfilled, because, even though I appreciate the need for mopping up the large purchasing power which is bound to be generated on account of the inflationary policies, the fact remains that if Government themselves, instead of taking any corrective action by which prices can be kept within reins, take deliberate steps to increase prices, then we should definitely have second thoughts about the success of our Plan. It is in the larger context of our planning that I am making this appeal to my hon. friend.

It may be that on this particular issue, even if I differ violently with him, I shall have sympathy for him in the sense that if there is a price lag between the manufacturing cost and the cost which the consumer pays ultimately, Government have to do something. But on the question whether that is to be so drastic or not, there can be genuine difference of opinion. But there can be no difference of opinion on the question that unless Government have a definite price policy for our Plan period, and take an overall view—as the Minister himself wanted to take when he made this speech as the Commerce and Industry Minister—we shall have to revise the targets in our Plan. But that is not the inten-

tion of anybody in this House, because the view here is that the targets in the Plan are modest, and if any attempt is made to reduce them or to scale them down, then the country is not going to put up with that.

So, I would once again appeal to him to formulate a long-range policy, a consistent policy which will fit in with the objects of increasing the standard of life in the country as also of maintaining the balance which we are trying to achieve in our Plan.

Shri Morarka (Ganganagar—Jhunjhunu): As the previous speaker has said, this is the first Bill of the new Finance Minister. I was, therefore, very anxious to find out some argument or some point to support him. But may I say that even after my very careful research and all sincere efforts, I have not been able to find a single point on which I can lend my support to this Bill?

The only point on which this Bill can be supported is that it is going to bring Government an additional revenue of Rs. 17½ crores. Apparently, the Finance Minister and also the Prime Minister deny that that is not the main purpose of this measure. If gaining revenue, collecting taxes or raising more money is not the aim of Government at all, then I think that the present Bill is most ill-conceived.

The main reason that we find for this Bill, in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, is:

“It is necessary to mop off these extra profits and the proposal in the Bill is intended to achieve this object.”

Assume, for a moment, that there are extra profits, and the mill industry is making huge profits; and Government are anxious to mop them off. But is this measure seeking to impose additional excise duties going to achieve that purpose? With great respect, I would say, it is not.

Let me endeavour to show how it is not going to achieve that purpose. In a seller's market, when there is

[Shri Morarka]

great demand, when the demand is more than the supply, the prices are dictated by the seller. Any increase in the price, whether it is due to the extra profits or whether it is due to some sort of tax, call it excise duty or sales tax whatever it be, is inevitably passed on to the purchaser, that is, the consumer. The profits of the mill industry and the profits of the wholesalers and retailers would remain intact and there is no provision in this Bill which I can see which is going to touch those profits. It is a different matter if the demand falls or because of the demand falling or because of the supply increasing, the prices come down. But so far as the measure contained in this Bill are concerned, that is, excise duties, they would have only one effect and that is to increase the prices of cloth. This would certainly not have the effect of reducing the profits of either the mill industry or of the wholesaler.

After stating the main objects in the statement of objects and reasons, two or three objects have been further added in the speech. The first is, arresting the increase in prices and the second is, discouraging consumption. If you kindly examine these two further objectives, you will find a direct contradiction. If the price increase is going to be arrested, where is the question of discouragement of consumption? If the price remains the same and the demand from the consumer continues to be the same, there is not going to be any discouragement of consumption.

If, on the other hand, the price is going to be increased, then the burden is going to be transferred to the consumer. Then and then only there may be some curtailment in the demand.

Now, Sir, it is said that on the eve of the Puja holidays, on the eve of certain other festivals like Diwali and Shankaranthi, the prices will increase. May I know why then this further impetus to the price increase, if it is not the intention of the Government to take money from the pockets of

the consumer? If Government wants to mop up the profits, there are certain other methods and machinery which can be adopted for the purpose, than the imposition of excise duty. If you increase the excise duties and you do not have any price control, the object will not be achieved. If there is an overall price control—I am not talking about distribution control; I am not talking about rationing which the hon. Finance Minister just now mentioned; I am only talking about price control—I can understand it. Then the profits of the mill industry or the profits of the wholesalers can be regulated. In the absence of any price control, if you only want to increase the excise duty, the only result will be a further increase in the prices. Whether this is the policy of the Government—just now to increase prices further—or not, I do not know. But we should expect that when there are inflationary tendencies in the country, if there should be one anxiety on the part of Government, it should be to keep the prices under check.

I just now heard the Finance Minister say that last Saturday he sent one of his officials to the market to make some purchases, to ascertain whether there had been any increase in prices or not. The officer came and reported 'no'. Very good. As you know, these excise duties are imposed on the mills and the mills pay these excise duties only when the cloth is manufactured and goes out of the mill compound. After the duty was imposed that is after last Friday evening and before Saturday, when this officer went out to purchase, I do not think any cloth could have come out of the mills. So all that the officer could have gone and enquired about in the market was about cloth belonging to previous stocks.

It may be that there were some wholesalers who did not want to make extra profit on account of this increase in duty and might have preferred to sell to the government official at the

same price as was prevailing before the imposition of the duty. But I do not know how that can become an argument, that because on Saturday one person could buy cloth at the same old price, therefore, these excise duties are not going to affect the prices or that the burden of these excise duties is not going to be transferred to the consumer.

I want to make one more point. Apart from the propriety of the blanket power which Government is now taking, of further increasing the duties whenever it likes, I think this would indirectly provide an impetus to the wholesaler to resort to hoarding—when the wholesaler knows that the Government would increase the excise duties further if the prices rise, he would withhold the stocks to make more profits. As I said, these excise duties are payable only at the time the cloth leaves the mill compound. Once it has left the mill compound, the excise duties are not payable by the wholesalers or the retailers, whatever the stock may be. It would always be the desire of the wholesalers and the retailers, in order to make more profit, to hoard the stocks so that when prices go up further, when Government increase the excise duties further, they would make more profits.

I cannot understand the philosophy lying behind this measure. I would respectfully urge upon the Finance Minister to reconsider this matter. If it is the desire of the Government that the extra profits made by the mill industry or by the wholesalers ought to be mopped up, for God's sake do not resort to this; this is not a measure which would enable you to mop up the extra profits. It would only hit the consumer and hit him hard. If there is an increase in prices, there will be a rise in the wholesale price index. It is going to create conditions in which further wage increase demands are going to take place. I think this may be only an impetus to the inflationary spiral rather than a curb on it.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-West): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am not sure if in the normal course of things I would have felt called upon to felicitate the new Finance Minister on entering upon his office. But things have happened so that far from congratulating him on his accession to a pivotal place in the country's governmental set-up, I feel like condoling with him on the dismal debut which he is making with a proposal of adding, without sufficient warrant, to the burden of taxation on the generality of our people.

I am not particularly conversant with the mysteries of high politics, but I have a suspicion that perhaps it was not just a coincidence that the Prime Minister shifted, at the time that he did, the burden of the Finance Ministry to the capable shoulders of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, shoulders which could perhaps take the buffeting from the people over this issue with more resilience and business-like *sang froid* than the Prime Minister can feel able either to muster or to afford. I have heard it also said about our new Finance Minister that having, as he does, control over Iron and Steel, he should be called our 'Iron Chancellor'. This expression was applied to Bismark in Germany, and when Bismark talked about socialism, which he did almost in the way that the Congress Government does in this country, he adopted a policy towards the working people of Germany which was described as a policy of 'kicks and kisses'. So when I hear Government spokesmen, not excluding the Finance Minister, I feel they are talking in benevolent terms to the people about the good time coming and so on and so forth, but in the meantime—which seems to be a prolonged 'meantime'—people are going to have agony and kicks and not the kind of kisses which are being symbolically put forth by declarations regarding the socialist pattern of society.

The Government's case in regard to this Bill rests, as far as I can make out as fairly as I can, on a three-fold argument, namely, that the Bill before

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee¹

us is an anti-inflationary measure, that consumption is increasing and therefore, it has to be checked; secondly, that this measure is intended to stimulate exports and earn foreign exchange, which is terribly important in the Second Five Year plan period; and thirdly that, in a minor way perhaps, there might be some little diversion of demand from mill-made cloth to handloom products. The Minister has given us certain significant statistics which show that the price of cloth is increasing and profits also are increasing. But nowhere is it shown that the proposed excise duty would really enable Government to mop up the excess profits of the industry. Actually, we have a feeling that Government has treated the cotton textile industry with a great deal of consideration. This industry has in the not very remote past reaped enormous profits, a phenomenon which has been more or less continuing in the same shape. In 1948, according to official statistics, the net profit made by the cotton textile industry had risen as high as 17.7 per cent., which was the highest among the 16 major industries in India. And later, when the general elections took place last time, there were open statements being made how the textile magnates, the sugar magnates and such like people were in league with the Government party and were assisting their election prospects because they had been treated well.

As far as mopping up the excess profits of industry is concerned, the Minister has given us no real indication as to how he can possibly do so. On the contrary, he has, almost by implication, pleaded helplessness in that regard, and even the spokesmen of industry have conceded that it would not be possible to mop up profits by the mechanisms which are envisaged in the process of the Bill. Besides, there is no mechanism of price control which Government can utilise, and in the absence of such a policy, there is nothing to prevent the industry from passing on to the con-

sumers the incidence of the new impost.

2 P.M.

Actually, it should be admitted in fairness to the representatives of the industry that they have said here as well as outside the House that the incidence of the new impost would have to be passed on to the consumer. Mr. Morarka spoke just now and I see that our friend Mr. Somani, who is not here, has made a statement in which he has made it very clear that it would be impossible for the industry not to pass on the incidence of the new impost to the consumer.

Already my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta has referred to certain comments made in the City Notes of the *Times of India* of the 1st September, but I feel I could quote a little more extensively what he has just indicated. In these Notes it is said:

"The general feeling is that (regarding the seller's market) with the current seller's market in cloth, the spate of increase in the excise will descend heavily on the consumer instead of mopping up a part of the mill profits."

Then it goes on to say:

"Market circles feel that the 100 per cent. rise in the duty on medium cloth will particularly hit the consumer as this variety comprises as much as 70 per cent. of the over-all cloth output and there is already a mounting pressure on supplies."

I wish particularly to draw the attention of the Minister to this matter of the medium variety of cloth, because I find that he has tried to take credit in the old way by saying that after all the lowest brand of cloth is being kept out of the picture. But the coarse variety does not exceed 6 per cent. or so of the total production of dhotis and saris and the greater part of it consists of fabrics used by the comparatively richer classes. Therefore, if a gesture can at least be made by the Minister at the conclusion of the discussion in regard to medium

cloth, then perhaps that would be something of a small mercy; but, as it is, the Bill is something which surely we cannot possibly support. It is not the industrialist, but the long-suffering and hard-pressed consumer who will have to pay the impost through his nose. The profit of the cloth industry has been such and the lack of any government apparatus to control the profits has been so blatant that we can easily envisage the picture which will be produced by the operation of this Bill.

Sir, it has already been mentioned how particularly at this present point of time we are on the eve of certain very important festivals which people look forward to when they have got to buy something particularly textiles, at least for the sake of the children. The Pujas are coming in Bengal, the Diwali festival will be celebrated all over the country and in the south, I do not exactly know, when, you have the Sankranti, as has been mentioned in this Government note. In a position like this the consumer resistance would be rather difficult. People have to buy at least a modicum of textile necessities and therefore they will suffer, because the Government has not got any apparatus to make sure that the prices would be controlled, that the profits would be mopped up. This is a point which I want particularly to emphasise in the course of this discussion.

I was a little astonished to hear the Minister saying that if prices rise as it seems they must, according to the present dispensation—there must be a simultaneous rise in taxes. On the contrary, I should say that the Minister might concede that for the time being his hands might be, comparatively speaking, tied if he is having in contemplation the price control policy which will make it impossible for simultaneous rise in taxation at the same time as prices rise. This kind of vicious circle is something which should be broken as soon as ever we can.

I wanted also to point out how it is rather unpleasant to hear that it is the intention of Government to stop people buying textiles, because we are told that the consumption *per capita* has increased. The consumption *per capita* has certainly increased. But by how much? In 1939-40 the availability *per capita* in yards was 15·75 and in 1955 we reached the magnificent figure of 15·9. Now the Finance Minister is very perturbed because our people today seem to have a *per capita* availability of 16·8 yards which is one yard more than what was available in 1939-40. I never knew that in the British days there was something like Rama Rajya which we are trying to emulate. If we approach the figure which is found here on record in regard to the British days we are rejoicing all over the place and if we exceed that figure we get afraid and we want the people to bear some additional load of taxation!

Besides, ever so many times the point has cropped up in this House. There has perhaps been some slight increase in the national income. But what is the extent of that increase, as far as the different groups of our people are concerned? As a matter of actual fact, if you go to the country, you do not find any visible signs of improvement in the living conditions of the people. I remember Mahatma Gandhi when he was tried in 1922 and sentenced to six years' imprisonment said in court: "no sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence which the skeletons in the Indian villages present to the naked eye", and he went on to add, "both England and the town-dwellers in India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unparalleled in history". He said, "no sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away" what we see with our own eyes in the countryside. The Finance Minister knows very much more than I do what exactly the situation is in different parts of the country.

Only the other day, perhaps in the context of the Food Minister's state-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

ment that soon everything will be lovely in the garden, we are going to have foodgrains from abroad and in this country also we are going to raise our food-grains production and so on and so forth, somebody in high authority pointed out how many people in our country, particularly in the South, have to live on the roots which grow under the soil from year's end to year's end, which is their staple food. That is the condition of things which we have to tackle and for Government to pose these figures, to point out that the people have greater purchasing power, that people are buying so many things, that prices are rising and that inflationary tendencies are at work may be all right from the point of view of text-book economics, but that is not all right from the point of view of unchallengeable facts and the all-out effort we must make to change the living condition of the people today. I feel particularly at a time when the Poojas are in the offing, when Diwali is going to be celebrated in eight weeks' time, it is a cruel irony that we are having this kind of legislation placed before us.

I would like also to very humbly draw the attention of the Finance Minister to what was said, as far as I remember by his predecessor, Mr. Deshmukh, after the Kaldor report was published. After the Kaldor report was published the former Finance Minister said that any Finance Minister in this country should henceforward look more towards direct taxation than towards indirect taxation. I would like him to remember that the former Finance Minister, his predecessor, had, perhaps in reply to the Budget discussion, or in answer to the discussion on the Finance Bill, said that he anticipated a very small rise in prices. Now his anticipation has been belied by what has happened. Now, for example, in the case of mustard oil which is an article very essential to the Bengali diet you find how prices have risen in sky-rocketing fashion. This sort of thing has happened all over the place and people

are trying to organise themselves in order to resist any disastrous rise in prices of these things which are absolutely essential for the life of the people.

Therefore I feel that this kind of Bill is extremely ill-advised. This kind of Bill is not by any means in conformity with the declared intentions of the Government and I want to warn Government that the tempers of the people are frayed. The people are not like donkeys. You cannot tell the people for ever that good time is coming in some uncertain future. There is a story about carrots being dangled before donkeys and naturally you can tempt the donkey to bear the burden for longer periods, but human beings are not like donkeys, and as you dangle carrots before donkeys, you cannot dangle the prospect of good time coming some time in the uncertain future before our people. Therefore, I feel that this is a Bill which should be opposed strenuously. But we know our strength in this House is by no means adequate to be of any effective opposition to whatever Government, with its steamroller majority, wants to impose on the House, I wish that the Finance Minister is advised to bring about certain changes in regard to medium cloth at least which impinges on the interests of 70 per cent. of the consumers and he should make a gesture which might make this measure slightly less unpalatable than it is at the moment.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, this Bill has been opposed by various Members for various reasons. Nobody has given his support to the purpose for which this Bill has been brought forward.

One of the main objects of the Bill is to mop off the extra profits that will flow into the pockets of the manufacturers and the wholesalers. I am afraid that the purpose cannot be realised in view of the obvious fact that indirect taxation generally is passed on to the consumers and it is

borne very little by the producers. The general law of economics of all production is that taxation on consumer goods is borne primarily, or at least mostly, by the consuming public. So the tall claim that is made in the Bill that it will take away the extra profits that are made by the producing classes is not true. I feel that this purpose which has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons is one that has been given out with a view to hoodwink the public. I feel that no student of economics would agree that even 10 per cent. of the indirect taxation will be passed on to the producers. We have to consider whether the consumers today are in a position to bear the extra burden. I am afraid that the consumers, the majority of whom belong to the poor and lower middle class, are not in a position to bear this increased burden.

A few days ago, Prof. Kaldor has submitted a wonderful report wherein he has stated that the taxation policy should be a comprehensive and broad one so as to include various kinds of taxation like the property tax, capital gains tax and such other taxes with a view to take away the increased amount of profit that the producers are making today. He complained that one of the greatest drawbacks of our taxation policy is a piecemeal approach to the problem of taxation.

Taxation is one of the methods by which we can reduce the disparities of income. It is only one of the methods. But, even here, the Government has not been able to evolve a policy which is either adequate or effective to realise the objective of what is called 'socialist pattern'. So, I feel that what Shri Asoka Mehta said, that this isolated measure will not be able to achieve the desired objective, the objective being of taking away or sharing in the profits of a few people who are entrenched in the industry, is correct.

I want to ask the Finance Minister humbly why he has chosen this textile industry alone for mopping off profits. There are other industries which are

making equally huge amounts of profits, for the last few months, because of the impact of inflation. Very many industries have been making large amounts of money.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem): What other industry is making so much profit?

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: All other industries generally, and, in particular, I may say the jute industry and the plantation industry. So, I ask why has he taken only one industry, the textile industry.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): A beginning in the right direction.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: It is not a good beginning; that is what I want to say. It would have been all right if there had been a comprehensive, integrated approach to the problem of taxation. I am sure that hon. Members will agree with me that this isolated, piecemeal approach to the problem of taxation will not do good because it touches only the fringe of the problem. If he is very serious about mopping off the profits from the business community, let him say it. We are going to support him provided he brings forward comprehensive measures of taxation with a view to reduce the profits in various ways. The present moment is inopportune, in my view, to impose excise duties on cloth. I say inopportune because the Pujā and various other festivals are coming.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East cum Ballia Distt.—West): You are right.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: That is an inducement for people to come forward in the market to purchase more and more. When there is a higher demand, I am sure, this taxation will not, in any way, result in consumers' resistance. There will not be any consumers' resistance in these two or three months because on special occasions there will be a growing demand for cloth. There is already an impression gaining ground, due to the

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

industrial policy of Government, that there is scarcity in the cloth market. So, the law of consumers' resistance will not operate. The demand will grow and if the supply does not grow proportionately or stands where it is, naturally, the whole burden will not only be passed on to the consumers but, I am afraid, the prices of cloth will still further increase, and thereby price control becomes an impossibility. I think that is one of the objects for which this Bill has been brought forward, that there should be some sort of check on the rising trend of prices in cloth. I think even that object cannot be realised in view of this special contingency. So, I feel the time is inopportune.

I may also say that if the Minister is very anxious to mop off profits, the best tax that can be thought of at the present juncture is excess profits tax. Usually, in all countries when profits are made in large quantities by a few people, the normal tax that is resorted to is excess profits tax. I do not know why the Minister is shy in levying excess profits tax on the business community. If excess profits tax is levied, I am sure the burden will fall directly on business and industry, and not on consumers. You will be realising thereby the second objective, that is, you will be able to comb out some of the profits of these people and thereby you will have indirect check on prices and even the cost of production. This is not therefore a good tax and this is not the time for such a tax, and I feel that this measure should be opposed.

Further, the Minister has said that the medium cloth and the coarse cloth are not very much taxed, and they are taxed lower than the fine and superfine cloth. The tax increase on medium cloth is 100 per cent., and on coarse cloth is 50 per cent. If this increase is called very small, I am really unable to swallow the argument. I feel that an increase of 100 per cent. and 50 per cent. on medium and coarse cloth is a very big increase,

and I am sure the Minister will take advantage of the blanket powers given in this Bill so that in future he may enhance the tax further on coarse and medium cloth. That will mean that the poorer sections of the people, the lower middle class, will be affected adversely. In a developing economy only a few people will make more money, disproportionately, when compared to the rate of development of the economy as a whole. A few people always make money, and special measures are required to take away or squeeze out some of the money that they earn. This is not one of the special measures. I generally support the view that, the dimensions, the breadth and the width and range of taxation should increase but in a comprehensive way, in a way that will be effective. The best way that will make taxation policy effective would be to follow the recommendations or to implement the recommendations of Professor Kaldor—with little changes here and there. Unless we have an integrated taxation policy, I am sure we will not be able to achieve our objective.

Lastly, I would say that the Minister has failed completely to follow a consistent price policy. One Five Year Plan has been over and we are in another Five Year Plan period. In these five years, prices have varied, and varied from time to time. At no period you will see that there was price stabilisation. There has always been fluctuation or variation to the disadvantage of the community as a whole. Only a few people through price manipulations have been able to amass wealth, and the Government has completely failed to control prices or stabilise prices at a suitable level. We have no price policy, we have no mechanism to control prices. In the absence of a price policy, in the absence of any mechanism to stabilise, especially the prices of consumer goods it will not be proper to resort to such taxation measures which are ultimately passed on to consumers and will not be borne by producers.

श्री वि० घ० बेशपांडे : मैं इस अवसर पर धन्य नये वित्त मंत्री महोदय को बधाई देने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ और बधाई इसलिये देने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने प्रथम बार अपनी सरकार का सच्चा स्वरूप जनता के सामने रक्खा है और उनकी सरकार किस प्रकार तानाशाही की तरफ जा रही है, उसका नग्न प्रदर्शन इस विधेयक द्वारा हमारे सामने हुआ है। लोग कहते हैं कि पूजा और दीपावली के पूर्व और निर्वाचन के पूर्व सरकार इस प्रकार के करों का प्रस्ताव लेकर सदन के सम्मुख किस प्रकार आ सकती है ? मेरी समझ में उसका कारण यह है कि सरकार समझती है कि वह जनता पर गोली चला कर भी चुनावों के समय उनके वोट पा सकती है और चुनाव जीतने की हिम्मत और हौसला रखती है और जब उसको ऐसा विश्वास है तो फिर कपड़े की कीमत थोड़ी बढ़ा देने से क्या होने वाला है। साथ ही सरकार को पूंजीपतियों के भी वोट आगामी निर्वाचन में मिलने का विश्वास है और वे समझते हैं कि पूंजीपतियों की मदद से वे आगामी निर्वाचन में जीत जायेंगे और पूजा के त्योहार के समय पर यदि कुछ लोगों को कपड़ा न मिले तो उससे कुछ बहुत बनता बिगड़ता नहीं है। मुझ पर वित्त मंत्री महोदय का बहुत प्रभाव पड़ा है यह मैं स्वीकार करता हूँ, प्रभाव उनके अर्थ ज्ञान का नहीं परन्तु उनकी विनोद बुद्धि का बड़ा पड़ा है। His sense of humour is really to be appreciated लोग जब उनसे कहते हैं कि यह आपने जो कपड़े में एक्साइज ड्यूटी (उत्पादन शुल्क) बढ़ाई है इससे कपड़े के भाव बहुत बढ़ जायेंगे और कंज्यूमर्स (उपभोक्ताओं) को कपड़े के लिये अधिक दाम देने पड़ेंगे तो वे कहते हैं कि भ्ररे साहब कपड़े के दाम कम हों, इसी के लिए तो हमने कपड़े का भाव बढ़ा दिया है और उनका यह जवाब मुझ को एक पोलिगैमी (बहु विवाह) वाले व्यक्ति

का बहुपत्नीवादी पुरुष का मालूम पड़ा जो कहता था कि मैं अनेकों शादियाँ इसलिये कर रहा हूँ कि मेरा ब्रह्मचर्य बढ़े। ठीक उसी प्रकार का तर्क हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय दे रहे हैं कि हमने कपड़े का भाव इसलिये बढ़ाया है ताकि कपड़े का दाम बढ़ने के कारण आगे चल कर कपड़े का दाम धीरे धीरे कम होगा और मैं यह कहे बगैर नहीं रह सकता कि this is adding insult to injury जर्मन पर यह तो नमक छिड़कने वाली बात हुई।

अभी हमारे महान् प्रजासमाजवादी लीडर श्री अशोक मेहता ने जो सोशलिस्टिक पैट्रन (समाजवादी व्यवस्था) और सोशलिज्म (समाजवाद) के बारे में जिक्र किया और उसका जो नया रूप बतला रहे थे, वे क्या कह रहे थे मुझे तो ठीक समझ में नहीं आया और वित्त मंत्री महोदय का भाषण और श्री अशोक मेहता की बातें सुनकर तो अजीब उलझन पैदा हो गई और वह तो Confusion worse confounded हो गया। आप कहते हैं कि देशवासियों को कम कपड़ा और केवल जरूरत भर का कपड़ा ही खरीदना चाहिये, तो मैं पूछता चाहता हूँ कि क्या जिस तरह से भगवान श्रीकृष्ण ने द्रोपदी का चीर स्रम नहीं होने दिया और धोती की बढ़ाते गये, क्या उसी प्रकार श्री कृष्ण की भांति सरकार ने देश भर में इतना कपड़ा तैयार करा दिया है कि जिसके कारण लोगों को कम कपड़े का इस्तेमाल करना शुरू करना चाहिये। महात्मा गांधी ने जब देखा कि हमारे देशवासी बहुत कम कपड़ा इस्तेमाल करते हैं और अधिकांश नंगे रहते हैं तो उन्होंने अपने बदन से कपड़े उतार कर फेंक दिये और केवल एक लंगोटी बांधना शुरू कर दिया और वे यदि लोगों से कम कपड़ा इस्तेमाल करने को कहते थे उनकी बात तो समझ में आने वाली थी लेकिन आपकी यह सलाह हमारे गले नहीं उतरती है।

[श्री वि० व० देशपांडे]

धमी बतलाया गया कि १५ गज कपड़ा हर व्यक्ति के पीछे इस देश में पड़ता है तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बड़े बड़े लोग हैं क्या उनका भी औसत पन्द्रह गज का ही रहता है ? यहाँ संसद् में और विधान मंडलों में जहाँ कि सदस्यों को नित्य नये साफ सुथरे कपड़े पहन कर आना होता है क्या उनके द्वारा पहने जाने वाले कुरतों, धोतियों और पगड़ियों और दुपट्टों का पर कैपिटल एक्ज (प्रतिव्यक्ति औसत) १५ गज ही रहता है ? तो मैं समझता हूँ कि १०० गज या २०० गज से कम में उनका काम नहीं चलता होगा । जब ऐसी हालत हो तब हमारे द्वारा लोगों को कम कपड़ा इस्तेमाल करने की बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती है और यह जो आप कपड़े की एक्साइज ड्यूटी (उत्पादन शुल्क) में बढ़ोत्तरी कर रहे हैं यह तो मुझे जनता के साथ एक बड़ा मलौल सा किया जा रहा मालूम देता है और यह जो मीपिंग अप औफ ओपरेशन किया जा रहा है इससे जो बड़े बड़े पूंजीपति और कारखानेदार हैं उनको लाभ होने वाला है और गरीब जनता के ऊपर और अधिक भार डाला जा रहा है और इस एक्साइज ड्यूटी में बढ़ोत्तरी करने का नतीजा यह होगा कि जब हमारे गरीब देहाती आदमी कपड़ा लेने बाजार में जायेंगे तो प्रति वर्ग गज के पीछे ४ आने और ६ आने के हिसाब से कपड़े की कीमत बढ़ जायगी । इससे कारखानेदारों का प्रोफिट (लाभ) कम कैसे होगा ? प्रारम्भ में जान बूझ कर इस विवेक के ऊपर बोलना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि मेरा अनुमान था कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री बहुत बड़े पंडित और उच्च कोटि के अर्थशास्त्री हैं यहाँ भी बड़े बड़े अर्थशास्त्री और पंडित बैठे हैं वह कोई बड़ा धोर और रहस्यमय वक्तव्य है जो बह दे रहे हैं और मैं उस को समझता नहीं । मैं बड़ी सूझता से और गम्भीरता से उन के वक्तव्य को सुनता रहा कि कोई ऐसी

बात वह कहें जिस से इन तीन बातों में से किसी का पता लगे कि किस प्रकार से कारखानेदारों का नफा कम होने वाला है किस प्रकार से जो यह कीमतें हैं कपड़े की वह कम होने वाली हैं और किस प्रकार से खादी तथा दूसरे प्रकार के कपड़े की इस से मदद होने वाली है । मैंने इन तीनों बातों में से किसी एक को भी नहीं देखा । मझ को तो एक ही बात समझ में आती है । हमारे वित्त मंत्री जो कहते हैं कि हम को साढ़े सत्तरह करोड़ रुपये की आवश्यकता नहीं वह बड़े भारी वीतरागी सन्यासी और महात्मा बैठे हैं उन को कोई जरूरत नहीं है । तो फिर जरूरत किसे है ? लोगों को दुःख है लोगों को क्लेश है भाव बढ़ रहे हैं । यह भी समझा जा सकता है कि किसी प्रकार से सरकार को अपना एक्सपोर्ट बढ़ाना है क्योंकि एक्सपोर्ट के बढ़ने से डालर अनिग (कमाई) होती है । मैं सोचता था कि इस तरह का कोई युक्तिवाद आयेगा, और इस तरह की कोई बात मैं सुनना चाहता था । लेकिन वह सुनने को नहीं मिला ।

हम ने अब तक जो विचार किया है जो अनुभव किया है वह एक ही है कि इस देश के जनमत का हमारी सरकार की नीति पर कोई प्रभाव नहीं हो रहा है जनता के साथ उस का कोई प्रत्यक्ष सम्बन्ध नहीं रहा है और जनता की भावना क्या है इस का उसे ध्यान नहीं है । निर्वाचन का परिणाम क्या होगा यह वह समझते हैं क्योंकि उन के साथ बड़ा भारी पक्ष संगठन है उस के बल पर वह निर्वाचन जीतेंगे । उन की समझ में यह नहीं आता है कि जनता के हृदय पर किस प्रकार से आघात होगा । पार्टी इन पावर जो है उस के अन्दर जनता की भावना का प्रत्यय नहीं है वह नहीं जानते हैं कि भाव बढ़ने से पंच वर्षीय योजना को सफल बनाने के लिये कैसे वह जनता का सहयोग ले सकते हैं ।

आप कहते हैं कि हमारी पंच वर्षीय योजना सफल हुई है मेरा इस पर विश्वास नहीं है क्योंकि मैं प्रत्यक्ष पाता हूँ कि यहां पर कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स (सामुदायिक परि-योजनायें) के विषय में अन्न के उत्पादन के विषय में बड़े बड़े वक्तव्य होते हैं। पहले कहने लगे कि २५ प्रतिशत अन्न का उत्पादन देश में बढ़ा है बाद में वक्तव्य आया कि ४० प्रतिशत अन्न का उत्पादन बढ़ा है कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स और नेशनल एक्स्टेंशन ग्लान्स (राष्ट्रीय विकास खण्ड) के जरिये से। एस्टिमेट्स कमेटी (प्राक्कलन समिति) का सदस्य होने के कारण मुझे कुछ कम्युनिटी प्रोजेक्ट्स को देखने का मौका मिला। मद्रास मैसूर और अनेक अन्य प्रान्तों में मैं गया हूँ तथा सात या आठ दिन बाद फिर जाने वाला हूँ। मैं प्रत्येक स्थान पर जनता से एक ही सवाल पूछता हूँ कि एक्स्टेंशन सर्विस ब्लाक (विस्तार सेवा खण्ड) होने के पूर्व तुम्हारा अपना उत्पादन कितना था और अब कितना बढ़ा है। मुझे सदा ही यही उत्तर मिला है कि पहले से उत्पादन कम ही हुआ होगा बढ़ा नहीं है। परन्तु यहां के प्रतिवेदन में यही चर्चा चलती है कि २५ प्रतिशत उत्पादन बढ़ा है और ४० प्रतिशत उत्पादन बढ़ा है। मैं ने रिपोर्ट में लिखने के लिये दिया है मुझे पता नहीं कि दिया जायगा या नहीं मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कोई ऐसा ब्लाक है जिस में एक तहसील में या एक जिले में ओवरआल प्रोडक्शन (कुल उत्पादन) बढ़ा हो।

इसी तरह के फिगर्स और संख्याओं को ले कर कपड़े के बारे में भी यहां कहा जा रहा है जो कि हर एक मनुष्य के लिये जीवनोपयोगी अत्यावश्यक वस्तु है। मैं इस को बहुत महत्व नहीं देता हूँ कि पूजा का समय नजदीक आ रहा है।

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : जाड़ा भी तो आने वाला है।

श्री बि० घ० देशपांडे : यह पूजा का उत्सव देश भर में होता है महाराष्ट्र में भी होता है जहां पर दशहरा के दिन नौ दिन पूजा होने के बाद नया कपड़ा हम उपवेश में लाते हैं, बाकी प्रान्तों में भी होता है, बंगाल में तो यह बड़ा भारी त्योहार है दीवाली नजदीक आ रही है।

श्री आचार्य कृपालानी (भागलपुर बूनिया) : साउथ में यह सब नहीं होता है।

श्री बि० घ० देशपांडे : साउथ में भी होता है नवरात्रि तो सब जगह होती है। मगर हिन्दुस्तान के किसी प्रान्त में यह नहीं होता है

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : हिन्दुस्तान बहुत बड़ा है।

श्री बि० घ० देशपांडे : कपड़ा पहिने के रिवाज हिन्दुस्तान के कोने कोने में हैं, कहीं पर भी लोग बिना वस्त्र के नहीं रहते। इस प्रकार की परिस्थिति होने के कारण मैं हाउस से यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस पर विचार करे कि हमारे वित्त यंत्री आज भी कोई एक्सप्लेनेशन (स्पष्टीकरण) नहीं देते हैं, वह हाउस को कोई परवाह नहीं करते हैं, किसी को पता नहीं लग रहा है कि किस कारण से यह अप्रत्यक्ष कर, इन्डाइरेक्ट टैक्सेशन, हमारे ऊपर लादा जा रहा है। मैं जानता हूँ कि आप को शक्ति प्रबंध है, और कितने भी अत्याचार हों, हमारे विरोधी भाई सरकार का विरोध करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। इस का प्रमाण हम ने देश भर में देख लिया है। आप ने देश को एक चुनौती दी है कि हम तुम्हारा कन्ल करेंगे, तुम पर गोलियां चलायेंगे, तुम्हारे ऊपर कर लगायेंगे, अगर हिम्मत हो तो . . .

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Sir, I rise on a point of order. Our friend is speaking about firings and other things. Are they relevant to this question?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Relevancy is a different thing from point of order. I was expecting something that might be legal or something like that. There is no point of order. The hon. Member is not going out of the way.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): He has built up a very fine case.

श्री वि० घ० देशपांडे : तो हमारी सरकार ने जनता को चुनौती दी है और वह चुनौती यह है कि हम किसी प्रकार का भी अन्यायचर तुम्हारे ऊपर करें, किसी प्रकार का भी अन्याय हम करते रहें, तुम्हारी हिम्मत नहीं है किं तुम उस का विरोध करो, हम जिस रूप से तुम को लात मारेंगे . . The boots with which we will kick you, you are bound to kiss. वह जानते हैं कि जिस जूते से वह जनता को लात मारेंगे, उसी का चुम्बन करने के लिये वह आयेगी। इस विश्वास के कारण सरकार और दूसरे लोग आप पर अन्याय कर रहे हैं और इसी कारण से यह कर आ रहा है, सरकार निर्वाचन के डर से नहीं . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should appear as if he is persuading others to his point of view. His language and the way he is addressing in the Parliament should be such as to show that he is trying to convert others to his point of view. Now it might appear as though he is compelling others to go against him.

Shri Kamath: If he cannot do it by persuasion, he might pursue other methods

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Here he has to go on persisting in persuasion.

श्री वि० घ० देशपांडे : इस प्रत्यक्ष सूचना के लिये मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ। मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से बड़ी नम्रता के साथ प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि हम जानते हैं कि हम आपको कुछ बिगाड़ नहीं सकते, हम जानते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता आप के विरुद्ध कार्य नहीं कर सकती, इसलिये इस कारण से नहीं, और इस कारण से भी नहीं कि निर्वाचन समीप आ रहा है या पूजा नजदीक आ रही है, बल्कि इस कोर्रण कि देश के घर घर में, ग्राम ग्राम में और नगर नगर में आप दुःख और दैन्य ले जायेंगे, इस से उसको बचाने के लिये आप यह एक्साइज ड्यूटी जनता पर न लाईं।

Shri K. P. Tripathi (Darrang): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Finance Minister when he moved this Bill put forward arguments saying that this measure is being undertaken for the purpose of mopping up the excess profits from the producers. Since then, it seems there has been some re-thinking on the matter and now it seems the argument has been shifted on to saying that there is an increase in consumption in the country which is more than the production and therefore the consumption has to be restricted by means of this duty.

Shri Morarka, who spoke a little while ago, has clearly pointed out that this is not going to be the effect. The point at issue is that the duty will be passed on to the consumer. The Finance Minister, or anybody else in this House or outside who has argued on this question, has not been able to prove or assert that it will not be passed over. If the duty is passed over, then obviously there is no decrease in consumption. If the duty is not passed over, then also there is no effect produced. In that case it is very clear that the purpose, which is now said to be the purpose of this

duty, will not be fulfilled. We have, therefore, been greatly distressed to find out why this duty is being imposed at all. There is no doubt that it will cause a great deal of suffering to the masses, the consumers. It is said that the consumption has increased. Which is the class whose consumption has increased? That is the point at issue. I was just looking into the figures of wage index. The wage index was 151 in 1953. In 1954-55, it continued to be at 151. That shows the wages have not increased. Now, obviously, if the prices increase, then the purchasing power of the same man who was getting a particular wage previously and who will continue to get the same wage now, would be reduced. To that extent, the standard of living which was possible for him even during the First Five Year Plan will have to be reduced in the Second Five Year Plan. Is it the intention of the Government that the Plan expenditure should increase and the standards should go on decreasing? That is the question at issue. If the Government says that the wages have increased, then I can understand. But the purchasing power which has increased in the country has not been met by a wage expansion, and the purchasing power has not increased by a wage expansion. It has increased by new industries coming into being. The wage-level being the same, it may be that where one man was employed formerly, one and a half men, say, are employed today. We may give some such figure; it is a tentative figure which is not correct either, because, the personnel employed in the factory and in the industries shows that there has not been much increase. So, the expansion in the purchasing power of the country has not occurred by way of wage expansion. Therefore, the purchasing power in the hands of the individual workers has not gone up. Thus, if you increase the prices, what happens? The purchasing power is reduced.

I was just collecting the figures and calculating what would be the effect of this policy. According to statistics,

agricultural labour earns Rs. 110 on the average, *per capita* per year. If 10 per cent. of this income is utilised for the purchase of cloth, what will be the effect? His capacity at present may be Rs. 11 for the purchase of cloth. So, I calculated that by this duty, his total cost will increase by 50 per cent. That means he will be able to purchase only half the cloth which he was able to purchase before. Similar is the case with the industrial worker.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am afraid that the hon. Member should not ask me to take him seriously, when I point out this. He says that by an increase of one anna per yard of cloth, the purchasing capacity with regard to cloth will be reduced by 50 per cent.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: I am referring to the power taken by the Government in their hands to increase the duty upto four annas. I was calculating on the basis of four annas. That is the power being taken by the Government. They say that they will adjust it as they desire in the course of the next few months. Although the duty now is put at a particular rate, they have the power to increase or adjust according to the excess profits which may be got in the course of a few months. Therefore, I was calculating on the basis of the increase of two annas on coarse cloth. Similarly, the cost may be calculated in respect of the other varieties of cloth. I was surprised to find that in the case of agricultural labour the capacity for the purchase of cloth would be reduced by 50 per cent. Similarly, calculating on the basis of the industrial workers, I came to the conclusion that their capacity to purchase cloth will also be reduced by 10 per cent. In the case of the ordinary agriculturist, whose income according to statistics is about Rs. 400, or between Rs. 400 and Rs. 500, the purchasing power of cloth would be reduced to the extent of about 12 per cent. Although we think that the cloth purchased is uniform, namely, 18

[Shri K. P. Tripathi]

yards, actually, it is not so. Actually, those people who are lowest in the rung are purchasing far less than that quantity, and their capacity to purchase after the passing of this Bill would be far more reduced.

What is the policy? Is the policy pursued in the Second Five Year Plan going to be one of reducing the standard of living? I think not. Therefore, I think that somebody has failed to think ahead and plan ahead for production so that the standards might be maintained. Obviously, in a planned economy, it should be possible for the planners to find out what is the standard that they are going to afford to the people at a particular point of time. It is from this point of view that I think Shri Asoka Mehta and others were arguing and saying that there should be an integrated approach to the tax system of the country.

It is very clear that if there is an excess profit it should be mopped up by an excess profits tax. It is as simple as day-light. Why is it that this simple device which is known to all is not pursued in this case. Why is it that a device, which has the added danger of being passed on to the consumer, being pursued now? In this case, it is not the mopping up of the profits that occurs. On the other hand, the mopping up of the purchasing power of the people occurs. Is it the mopping up of the purchasing power that is intended now? So, I humbly beg to submit that in a planned economy, Government should take it for granted that prices are going to rise not merely with regard to cloth, but with regard to every article in the expenditure which has to be incurred in the next five years, especially against an inflationary pressure. Therefore, in any planned economy which pushes production in a country, there must be a system of price maintenance. What is the mechanism which has been developed for price maintenance? Nothing? That is the question which we ask and

which is never answered. Without the mechanism to maintain prices, how will you raise the standard of the people?

Now, the price of cloth has increased. The price of food has increased. Suddenly, when the price of food increased, they came forward with the idea that there should be some import from abroad. In this way, a hit-and-run method, an unplanned method, is followed. This is most unfortunate. Who is the man that is exposed to the highest risk in such an economy? Obviously, it is the lowest man in society. He wants protection. When we entered the first Plan period, the position was that with price control everybody could get a limited amount of cloth at a particular price. Now, that protection is gone. Then, anybody could get some kind of cloth at a limited, enforced price. Now, the price has increased and the Government say that they will increase it further. The protection which the people used to get then will not be given now. Even before the first Plan period, it was possible for an ordinary man to get some amount of cloth out of the controlled shops, but now it is not possible. If he has no purchasing power, he cannot purchase any cloth. This measure has, therefore, set the clock back in the country.

I therefore request the Finance Minister to think as to how the common man, the ordinary man, the man in the village and in the workshop, may be assured of some kind of cloth at a reasonable price. Unless there is an assurance, that he will be able to purchase some-kind of cloth continuously at a set price, it would not be possible to run the Plan.

Already, there was a demand for wage increase. When the demand was made, this measure of taxation was not known. The demand for higher wages will increase further. This is not a one-way traffic. If the purchasing power is taxed, naturally, the working class will be entitled to

ask for a higher wage, and if higher wages are demanded, how will the Plan calculation stand? Will the Plan calculation be thrown over-board and a new calculation be brought forward? What will happen to the limits set for the purpose of the Second Five Year Plan? This question has not been answered.

Therefore, I humbly submit that prices have to be maintained. The prices of all commodities cannot be maintained; I understand it. In the course of the discussion of the Budget, I argued this point. I said that in respect of four or five fundamental things, we would have to maintain the prices. I said that you must have to maintain the prices all through the Second Five Year Plan period, in respect of cereals, pulses, edible oils and cloth. You may call the cloth, 'people's cloth' for this purpose. Call it 'dhoties' and 'saris'. Fix some length, but there should be one type of cloth which is used by the masses in the country. If you maintain the prices of these few commodities at the same level all through the Plan period, then it may be that you may maintain your Plan; otherwise, it will explode into smithereens and you will not be able to maintain it. With great reluctance and a feeling of pain, I have realised today that the Government has no price policy and has no plan to maintain the prices and to ensure a standard of living at a particular level.

So far as controlled economy is concerned, an assurance was given, but there is no controlled economy today.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: We do not want control.

Shri K. P. Tripathi: Madam friend says, "we do not want control"; does she want that people should die and go naked? What will happen to the man who has no purchasing power, if the prices increase? Speaking on the duty on edible oils and mustard oil, the Finance Minister said during the last Budget session that the increase in duty would not be passed on to the

consumer. In May, 1955 the index was varying between 65 and 80; in May, 1956, the index has almost doubled. Have they been able to control this? The Bengal Government tried recently to control this and failed miserably. Edible oil is one of the main items of food. If the Government has a planned economy, why should not they have a planned price policy at least for these 5 or 6 items of life, which are necessary for the whole society? After all, cloth is a social necessity. Man does not need cloth, but society forces him to put on cloth. So, why should it not be the duty of the society to make him purchase the cloth also?

I humbly beg to submit to the Finance Minister with all the earnestness at my command that the working classes in this country will be hard hit and they need protection. I know that the Finance Minister has great love for the working classes and the ordinary men of the country and I hope it would be possible for him to devise a policy whereby that protection may be assured. I submit that the measure brought forward now will not protect them and will expose them to the greatest difficulties. In view of this and in view of the great opposition from all quarters, I hope the Minister will reconsider the matter. There has been considerable rethinking on this matter; I think that rethinking should be continued.

Shrimati Sushama Sen (Bhagalpur South): My predecessor has just appealed to the hon. Finance Minister on behalf of the working classes. I want to appeal to him on behalf of the women of the country. This measure really affects the women, I will not say more than men, but it does affect them. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us hear the women's point of view in it.

Shrimati Sushama Sen: Already excise duties on edibles have gone up so much that it is difficult for the housewife to feed the family; now you want to restrict the cloth also. I

[Shrimati Sushama Sen]

would appeal to the Finance Minister that before we attempt to take more money for the exchequer for development schemes, it is more necessary to develop the human beings and I for one feel that the children must be clothed and fed properly.

We find from the figures given to us, as has been already pointed out by Mr. Mukerjee, that in 1939-40, during the British rule, the *per capita* consumption of cloth was 15·75 yards. Then it went down and down till in 1945-46 it came to 11·25. Then, in 1950 it was 9·7 and in 1951, 11·7. Now it has risen only to 15·9. Why do we want to cut down what we have got in these three years? When we had the control system, we knew how difficult it was to take even one piece of saree. When I was in my constituency, I found that the women could not afford even one piece of cloth. Therefore, even a rise of 2 pice or 1 anna in the duty would be too much for them. I appeal to the Finance Minister not to raise the price of at least medium and coarse cloth. As far as fine and superfine cloth are concerned, perhaps those who are in a better position might be able to afford them. Even there, as has been pointed out by Mr. Morarka, there should be no increase in the duty. I quite agree with him, because production of cloth should be increased and not decreased. We have to increase our production not only of mill-made cloth, but cloth made in handlooms and khadi. We should produce more cloth and the surplus should be sent for export.

I would join the others in appealing to the Finance Minister not to increase the duties at this time when the Dusserah and the Diwali festivals are on, because it is at this time that the housewife has to buy cloth for almost the whole year, and she would be more hard hit if you impose this tax at this time.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: The ex-Commerce and Industry Minister

made an exciting appearance—as the new Finance Minister—with a big contribution to the public exchequer. But, I am sorry to say that he has not got that welcome that is due to him. As the Commerce and Industry Minister, he had a very brilliant record and because of that fact, he was put into this Finance portfolio to bring stability and consistency in the financial policy. But, I am sorry to say that his first appearance is very cold. From the House he has not got a single word of support. This is a very serious matter.

Shri B. Das (Jhajpur—Keonjhar): Can the hon. Member make such personal reflections?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing personal here.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I am sorry to say that he got a very cold House on his first appearance. When public appearance tours are organised, it is always expected that the artist, wherever he or she goes will get appreciation and glamour. But, the new Finance Minister's coming to the House, with this Bill is quite unfortunate, because not a single word of support has come from the Members. I also join my humble voice in opposing this Bill, because we are representatives of the poorer people in the country and it is our right and duty to be their spokesmen.

As my hon. friend said before, the Dusserah and Diwali festivals are coming, I know how the minds of the public people are working. This increase in the excise duties just before the Dusserah festival has put panic in the mind of the public. They are really panicky as to what is going to happen to the price level, if this sort of thing goes on. This is the sort of thing that is happening. The prices are steadily rising and in addition to that the Government comes forward with an additional burden over their head. This is something very unfortunate. The price of cloth is already going up, and over and above that,

Government comes, not with a medicine to check the rise in prices or with a balm to remove the pain, but with an additional burden to be put on the public.

3 P.M.

You will remember that last time when the ex-Finance Minister levied excise duty on cloth that was not very palatable to the country. And as he had a keen appreciation of the public sentiment, he came in the Finance Bill with a reduction of the excise duty. But what happened? Meanwhile, all the cloth were sold and it brought Rs. 12 crores to the public exchequer; and that money came not from the richer section because they can afford to buy any time they like but from the poor section who had to buy clothes and other things for the Holi. We all know that everyone of our countrymen who can afford to buy even one yard of cloth will reserve that money and will make that purchase at the time of Dussehra, Diwali or Holi. That mistake we committed and I think it proved to us very costly. There was lot of unpopularity for this Government because the excise duty was levied at the time of the Holi and it was withdrawn immediately after that. It created an impression that the Government want to help the industrialists or the producers and do not want to help the poor public because they showed that they can give relief to the industrialists or the producers and not to the public. Therefore, I would like to emphasise that we have been hasty and it is inopportune to bring this measure at this time. The new Finance Minister like every newcomer has come with a more forcible enthusiasm and has given us a dose of medicine that we refuse to accept. Because I don't think it is going to give any relief to the public.

He has advanced the argument that the extra profit that is being earned by the producers and mill-owners or the industrialists will be curbed. I do not know how he arrives at this conclusion. I do not command as

much knowledge of economics as he does but I also claim to know a little of the ABCD of economics and I know that without making any change to the cost structure and the price-level, he cannot bring any relief to the public. Now, he has come up with a new taxation. But he forgets that the price can only be increased or reduced by making a change in the cost structure. The hon. Minister himself has stated that the cost structure does not match the price structure. So, he should have come forward with a measure that would have balanced the price structure with the cost structure. But that he has not done and he has put this additional burden on the public. He very well knows that the demand for cloth has not risen so much, due to the increase in purchasing power as due to the expansion of the purchasing power. Many people are employed and, therefore, they are purchasing cloth to satisfy their basic needs. If I get Rs. 15 today and I purchase 15 yards of cloth, it does not mean that tomorrow I am going to buy 20 yards because I would be getting Rs. 20 tomorrow. That does not happen in our country. The purchasing power has undergone a vast change and has expanded, so the demand has also expanded. But this demand has not increased due to the increase in purchasing power in the hands of a particular individual. This is one of the important points that should be taken into consideration. Our common man is still very poor and he is still below the subsistence level. Therefore there is no good in increasing this excise duty and in turn reducing the purchasing capacity of an individual who has already no purchasing power with him. Therefore, I feel that the hon. Minister must take into account the feelings of the House in this regard.

It is quite surprising that an increase of Rs. 17.5 crores in taxation is brought out by this measure. In the last budget the increase in revenue that was expected was only Rs. 34.15 crores and remarks were made about that budget that it was a very accom-

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

modating budget because the public sentiment has to be geared up with the Plan, public enthusiasm has to be encouraged and public co-operation has to be called for; so the time is not opportune—price level being shaky and deficit financing coming into the picture, to increase the taxes, and this budget therefore has been a very good budget; the Finance Minister made a statement on these lines at that time. I think some newspaper man had asked me about my impression on the budget and I said: let us wait; this-is-a-wait-and-see budget. We have waited and now seen that the excise duty has been increased to exorbitant rates. So, this levy is not in lines with the budget as it was presented to the House at that time. That budget only taxed the people to the extent of Rs. 34.15 crores. On the other hand this one measure taxes the people to the tune of Rs. 17.5 crores and I don't think this very first contribution of the Finance Minister is very happy. Rather I am afraid, the new Finance Minister is going to prove to be a very merciless tax collector.

He has taken all the pains in appearing reasonable by saying that the textile industry will bear this burden of the additional profit and these rises in prices would not go to the consumers' shoulders. I do not know what are the statistics and what is the index with him on the basis of which he makes this statement. It is a fundamental principle in economics that indirect taxes are never shouldered by the actual producers or actual owners of the goods. They are always passed on to the consumers unless and until there is a heavy price-fall that it reduces the demand to such an extent that it would compensate the extra receipt from the higher prices. But that can only be done in respect of non-essential goods. About essential goods there is no question of elasticity. The theory that he has applied in this measure cannot be applied to cloth and food. Cloth and food being very essential goods for the human life, their demand is very

inelastic demand. As I said earlier, this demand is still inelastic in spite of the fact that the hon. Minister has come to the floor of the House and tried to show that this demand is elastic because the demand for cloth has shot up. As I said earlier, the demand of individual has not gone up; it is the expansion of the purchasing power that has taken place and that has expanded the demand for cloth. Therefore, I think this theory or principle cannot be applied to food and cloth. There is no question of elasticity in these two respects. Specially, as so many friends have pointed out, during Dusserah time there is a general tendency for prices to rise, because it is generally being guided by the demand and supply theory. It is also guided by the principles of diminishing returns. It is obvious that when people cannot cope with the demand the prices have to rise. But this time the price has gone to an abnormal level. We cannot compel the buyer who has a social and religious obligation not to buy a piece of cloth or a few dhoties or a few clothes for the children. It is not for the pleasure of the hon. Minister or for the pleasure of anybody that a person buys the cloth. It is a social and religious obligation for him; he has to buy the cloth. Therefore, it is a very inelastic demand. The poor fellow with his philosophical resignation considers it his *fait accompli* to pay a higher price; and the Government has added his burden by passing this levy on to him. I do not know what is the reason that has guided the hon. Minister with all his reasonableness and practical commonsense to come forward with this measure. He should say on the floor of this House that he has been guided by mopping up of the profit or some such thing. We are not at all convinced by his arguments. It is quite obvious that he has come here as a revenue collector. This is a measure that is going to collect revenue up to Rs. 17.5 crores. This was the first chance of the Finance Minister and he has created a record that on the very first

chance available to him he has collected revenue worth Rs. 17.5 crores. That may add some feathers to his cap; but it will take some feathers out of the country's cap. I feel that by this measure, he is making his first appearance as a ruthless revenue collector. I do not know whether this will produce very beneficial results for him or the country.

The Plan is before us. Public co-operation is one of the most important factors that has to be taken into account. It is much more important than the allocation of resources. It is much more important than your financial capacity. It is much more important than anything else. If you do not have resources, if you do not have finances, you can go before the country and tell the people, here is our financial condition, because we are not able to get any aid, we have no big taxable capacity, so we are not able to implement these schemes that we have put in the Plan. I think the people will understand this. I do not think that the Indian people are so unreasonable as not to understand the shortcomings of the Government and the country as well. Now if this Bill puts forward the excuse that it wants to raise additional revenue for financing the Plan, I think it is not going to cut many nuts. Sir, I think public co-operation is much more important than collecting revenue. And public co-operation and public enthusiasm can be upset by the slightest shake-up that you are giving. In our country public enthusiasm has yet to mature. This enthusiasm you have to fan constantly to make the people join their hands in the implementation of the Plan. After a careful consideration, in the beginning of the second Plan, you brought a lukewarm budget and now you have come with such a measure as would upset all your good deeds in these six or seven months. I think the Finance Minister will give some further thought to the matter and try to take away this Bill, not to push forward this Bill. It is no good overriding the wishes and feelings of the Members of Parliament. We

represent the whole country here. We speak in their voices. So, I think he will take serious note of these feelings of the Members of Parliament. It is a fundamentally wrong thing to force the people to live on subnormal consumption. It can never do you good. All your principles, all your theories and all your activities should lead to a higher standard of living. But if you force the people to live on a subnormal consumption level, I think this sort of policy is improper. Therefore, I would again beg of the Finance Minister to find out, with all the genius at his command, a relationship between the cost structure and the price structure and find remedies there and not come forward with a Bill to tax the people.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Purnea *cum* Santal Parganas): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I support this Bill, because its object is very good, to mop up the excess profits realised by the mill-owners. But, I oppose the provisions because, they won't lead to what the Finance Minister aims at.

The Minister of Defence Organisation (Shri Tyagi): What a good support!

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I would have been glad,—not I—the country would have been glad if the new Finance Minister with all his genius and capacity could mop up the profits which these friends have realised from the pocket of the poor. But, this measure will indirectly help them. This measure is not going to achieve what is aimed at. This duty will be definitely passed on to the consumer. We would like to have from the Finance Minister a categorical answer to this question. I say the burden of the excise duty will be passed on to the consumer. If he says that it will not be passed on to the consumer, if he says that the provisions of this Bill are there and if he will say that in such a contingency, he will find means which, excluding this Bill, will support him in checking the vagaries of the millowners, we will support this Bill and we will see that this is passed into an Act.

Shrimati Benu Chakravarty: We have to see in any case.

Shri Bhagawat Jha Azad: I definitely will not say that. In the first three months, at least 60 per cent. of the new duty will be passed on to the consumer. In the second three months, definitely, it will go up to 80 per cent. and gradually, the entire burden will be passed on to the consumer. I know that we require money for financing the Plan. We are prepared to share the burden. Let the Finance Minister say that the common man has to share the burden,—we will speak to the people and say we want money for financing the Plan, and so you will have 10 instead of 15 yards—instead of asking us to support the measure saying that this is for mopping up the profits. We cannot do that.

We can ask our Finance Minister to give us facts and figures. The Finance Minister, in his jugglery, will give us facts and figures. He can give 10, 20 or 40 pages of facts and figures. I will plead my innocence, I will plead my foolishness and tell him, you can give me all these facts and figures, but I have not got the brain to explain it to the people. Probably, in this House, one man, the Finance Minister and his other friends on his right and left can understand this measure that he has brought before the House. The others cannot understand. If we cannot understand that, how can we say that this measure will mop up the profits and the money will be given back to us?

The question has always been of raising the standard of living. How? By giving more cloth, by giving more food. What is this strange thing? You know 80 per cent. of our people are farmers. For what they are producing in their fields, you are going to reduce the price by importing surplus from America. For what they want, you are going to increase the price. The poor people want kerosene oil, clothes, etc. The cloth price will shoot up immediately. In three months it will go up like anything.

You concede that. I know that the price will go up. Even without this excise, it will go up because of the operation of the law of supply and demand. There is more demand and less supply. That point has to be satisfied that there is going to be mopping up. I know the Finance Minister the ex-Commerce and Industry Minister of India. He was responsible for planning for cloth. When we asked for Ambar Charkha, he shouted at the top of his voice and then we conceded. He said, power looms and other things. Till yesterday, he was there. Government planned ahead to see that the consumption goes up. When the Karve Committee said that it will be 18·5 per cent. the ex-Commerce and Industry Minister said, 21·1 per cent. Now that he has failed, he pleads helplessness. He says, I cannot do. The price will go up. Because he is helpless and the price will go up, he comes with another measure which will further increase the price. The theory given to us is that the prices cannot be raised and that it can be raised only to the extent to which the market will bear. We know what the market is and what it can bear. Suppose the price is Rs. 2-8-0. Can we say that after this tax, it will only go up to Rs. 3-8-0? Can he say that the price will go up only to that extent and no more? This is the very simple proposition. If the Finance Minister in his first appearance can assure us and can show to the country, how this measure will mop up the profits, we will give our full support. Let him assure that the duty will not be passed on to the consumer. This is the one simple question. Let him answer that point. We will support him. But, he cannot say so. If he cannot say so, he has no right to say that we will mop up the profit. Let him revise the provisions of the Bill. Let him say straightway, I am bringing this measure, 50 or 60 per cent. will go to the consumer and 40 per cent. to the industry; we will be glad. We will tell the people, we want money, here is a new Finance Minister, he does not want to go to any

foreign country, he does not believe in asking from foreign countries. He wants money from us, therefore let us cut down our consumption of cloth. Let us cut it down to ten yards. When he was Commerce and Industry Minister he said that he would give us 21 yards. Now as Finance Minister he says do not consume even 15 yards. In that way we can speak to the people and make them understand, but we cannot understand this because this is not mopping off the profits, but mopping off the poor consumer. Therefore, I feel that this measure cannot achieve what it intends. The object is laudable, to mop off profits. If that was the object are there not other weapons in the armoury of the Government? Shri Asoka Mehta, an economist and expert said you could have excess profits tax. But the Finance Minister will not have it because it will go beyond and reach the other industries also. But why this way, which is definitely doubtful, as it will be passed on to the consumer? There are other ways of mopping off profits. Therefore we cannot support the Bill as the poor man will be hard hit.

An Hon. Member: But you said you were supporting the Bill.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: You could not understand what the joke was. At least let me say once that I support.

And what a nice occasion have they chosen. He himself said it is Dusserah, therefore there will be demand for cloth. If the cess is 8 annas the profiteers will put up the price of cloth by much more. So, this is the present to the people on the eve of Dusserah and Diwali by the new Finance Minister: either you reduce your consumption or pay more. I cannot support it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Thanu Pillai. I might make one submission. Most of the arguments have been advanced and points made. There is a large number of Members who want to add their voice one way or the other. I would request them to con-

dense their remarks and take less time. Ten minutes would suffice I suppose.

An Hon. Member: Five minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Five minutes in normal cases and ten minutes in special cases.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: When taxation to the tune of Rs. 17½ crores is to be made on the country, people should speak for five minutes only? It is a tragedy of fate.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I thought most of the points had been made. I have no objection to the House taking more time or longer time, but the difficulty is I have got the names of 30 Members who want to speak. Only ten have spoken so far. There are very important Members who want to speak. I do not say it should be confined to five minutes. Would ten minutes be all right?

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: The Chair has got the right, with the consent of the House, to extend the time to any extent it pleases, and in a matter like this in the interests of the Government and in the interests of the debate, the time should be extended.

Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan (Dindigul): I hope you will give me an opportunity to say a few words. It is very seldom we ask for a chance to speak, but this is a very important question and I think it is very necessary to give us a little time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I assure the lady Member that women shall have adequate representation in this debate.

Shri S. S. More: This is discrimination against the males.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Thanu Pillai.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): I was waiting for an opportunity to welcome and congratulate the new Finance Minister, but there is this difficulty in the way that the first Bill is a very difficult Bill for us to consume. From the point of view of handloom weavers this would be a

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

very good measure, but from the point of view of the consumer whose budget has to be adjusted it is a very difficult measure. Hon. Members here who wanted to curtail mill production and spindleage now shout here that prices have gone up and this cess is being levied. This seems to be the fore-runner of our future textile policy wherein we cannot have the luxury of using 20 or 25 yards.

This cess which is said to be to mop off the profit is mopping off the budget of the common man. That is our grievance. If on the other hand this revenue is utilised for increasing the handloom rebate, we will consider the possibility of lending our support to this Bill, because though there are some people who do not want to go in for handloom cloth at all, those people who would go in for handloom cloth in preference to mill cloth may have an opportunity of adjusting their budget. For the Government to say that they have no other way except to enhance the cess is I submit like saying that because we cannot stop highway robbery, we should license robbers.

Food prices are increasing. Rice worth Rs. 30 is now being sold at Rs. 56. Can we say that we will levy a cess of Rs. 20 per bag of rice? People cannot live without eating, nor without clothing. Already we are a half-fed nation, now we will have only a loin cloth if this policy is pursued and people are made to pay exorbitant rates for every day consumer goods.

While the price of cotton of the medium variety has gone up very little, not even one per cent., the price of cloth has gone up by 40 per cent. If Rs. 2 worth of cloth goes up in price by even 25 per cent. the price will increase to Rs. 2-8-0 or more. If you increase the duty even by six annas you are not going to mop off all the profit. You will be only acquiescing in the position that the trader and the mill-owner can say: "Your Government has levied the cess, and therefore

we are forced to increase the prices." We had the right of criticising the mill-owner and trader that they were anti-social elements trying to exploit the situation and making more money, but here the Government comes to help them to say they are levying higher price because the Government are levying the duty.

People who had made money in the first World War had to lose it soon after because there was no control and no restriction. They hoarded stocks and when prices fell they all lost heavily just after the war. But during the Second War because of our control policy the trader did not hold big stocks. Whoever made black money continued to be a millionaire or multi-millionaire and had no occasion to lose the money which he had made. This is the type of help the Government gives to the exploiters.

I plead that this Bill, if it cannot be withdrawn, should be so amended that the revenue of Rs. 17½ crores should be passed on to the people by way of rebate on handloom.

Shri S. S. More: I confess that I cannot understand properly the motive of the Finance Minister in introducing this sort of measure on the eve of the election. He has appended a Statement of Objects and Reasons to the Bill. In that statement, he has categorically stated:

'It is necessary to mop off these extra profits and the proposal in the Bill is intended to achieve this object.'

In the light of the remarks which he addressed to this House this morning, it transpires that this Bill has not one single objective only; it is a multi-purpose Bill, if I can borrow that idiom from the co-operative literature. The Minister has got many purposes in view. Possibly, mopping up the profits may be one of the subsidiary purposes. But as he replied to my interruption, preventing the rise in consumption by the people is the main purpose.

It is time for us to discuss whether this is a purpose consistent with the objective of our planning, planning as stated in the light of our constitutional objectives, namely that the standard of living of the people has to be raised. Now, has the standard risen? Have the people been able to raise their standard to a level which can afford mopping up or depressing that standard?

According to the figures circulated to us, we find that the present rate of consumption per capita is 15.9 yards. I come from Maharashtra, and I believe, for the mode of dressing on the part of the men and women in Maharashtra, at least 20 yards per capita per year is the minimum that they can have. According to their social notions, the way in which their communities live, and the way of their standard of life, anything less than this would be looked upon as derogatory to their social status.

Again, take the case of the Punjab, where most of the Sikhs put on turbans and have a variety of clothes to wear, as a matter of social etiquette. Even there, a 15-yard standard would be something which will be very harmful to their social status.

The Finance Minister says that he wants to put a stop to the consumption on the part of the people. He ought to have come out with the figures. As far as the different sections of the people are concerned, the National Sample Survey have taken a survey of the living standards of these sections, and the Minister ought to have come out with the figures showing in what particular section of the people, the standard is going beyond a level which is likely to be dangerous to the country. I need not labour the argument which has been advanced by a good many hon. Members. In fact, most of the Congress Members who have opposed this measure have said with unanimous voice that the burden of this taxation will not be falling on the shoulders of the capitalists who

look upon the Finance Minister as one of their friends, but it will fall upon the poor unhappy consumer. I do not want to go into the details of this matter.

But it is time for us to think that if inflation is setting in, there is also likely to be a tendency on the part of the producers, and particularly manufacturers, to take advantage of the surplus money that is set in circulation, and rise their prices. They will be performing the function which the Finance Minister is out to perform with a view to keeping the rising standard or the rising consumption of the people at a certain level. When a millowner raises the prices of a dhoti from Rs. 6 to Rs. 8 or Rs. 9 to some extent, he succeeds in putting a stop to the rising consumption.

But the real objective of our State ought to be to increase the standard. I feel personally, that if we leave the production of consumer goods to private agencies, if we allow also the freedom to them to increase the prices at their sweet will—because there is no machinery for controlling the prices effectively—then the only way by which we can do it is by nationalisation, I would demand that the whole textile industry ought to be nationalised. If it is not going to be nationalised, it ought to be treated as a separate and exclusive sector for the co-operative societies, so that whatever rise in prices is there can be controlled by Government, and there will not be profit motive, so far as the running of this great industry is concerned. If, however, there are any surplus or excessive profits, Government will be in a position to divert to those profits for some constructive objective.

My submission is that it is high time that instead of passing this measure which has come before the House, we take some bold step for the purpose of nationalising or 'co-operativising' the whole textile industry sector.

Most of us have read the report which has been submitted to

[Shri S. S. More]

Government by Mr. Thapar who led the delegation to China.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Appeals from the Chair have gone unheeded. There are so many voices loud enough to reach here. I would request the hon. Members to talk in a subdued voice, if they have to.

Shri S. S. More: I want particularly the undivided attention of the Finance Minister, because the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is keeping him busy with some other matters. That should not be allowed here.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Absolutely with regard to this matter, and in regard to no other matter.

Shri S. S. More: Then, the House may be adjourned for your consultations.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: He is asking him to withdraw the Bill.

Shri S. S. More: Mr. Thapar has submitted in his report that China is making rapid progress, and China has been able to secure the growing enthusiasm of the people. But we are not succeeding in the same way. My submission is that our financial policy and our taxation policy are mainly responsible for stopping and preventing the flow of public enthusiasm.

Whenever the common man is supposed to make a better living, whenever the common man finds some money in his pocket for the purpose of necessary expenditure on essentials of life, our financial policy is directed immediately, by indirect taxes, to take away the surplus money which may be jingling in his pocket for some time. Every time, he feels that whenever Government are in difficulty, he is the target; whenever Government have to make any progress, his progress has to be stopped first, in order to secure the progress of the nation. If stopping the progress of the common man, and stopping the rise in his

standard of living is a condition necessary for the evolution of a welfare State, then, that man is not interested in the creation of such a welfare State.

I feel that the times are not opportune. On the contrary, Members of the Opposition must thank the Finance Minister for giving them a good weapon, and a good stick with which to beat the party in power at the time of the next election. But we are not taking such a partisan view; we feel that the country's interests are much higher than our party interests.

I would, therefore, request the Finance Minister, with the help of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, to see his way to withdraw the Bill, because unless he withdraws the Bill, we will not be able to assure the consumer that this House is acting like the protecting guardian of his interests, and we shall merely be supposed to be rubber-stamps; that is to say, whatever is in the interests of the capitalists is passed through, after giving in the Statement of Objects and Reasons some information which is not a correct information, and some statements which are as far away from truth as possible.

Therefore, I would say that this is not a good time for this measure, from the point of view of the consumer, particularly on the eve of Dusserah, Diwali and Sankaranthi. As some hon. Members have emphasised, these poor people find these holidays the only holidays on which they can go to the bazar and purchase some cloth, but if this measure is passed, the Finance Minister will be sitting there with his rod of excise increase, every time the poor man goes to the bazar. This is not a good policy, and certainly not a wise policy. So, from the point of view of the nation, and also from the point of view of the party in power which is to face a huge electorate at the next elections, I would say that this measure should be withdrawn.

Shri V. B. Gandhi (Bombay City—North): I rise to support this Bill in its limited objective of mopping up the excessive profits of the middlemen in the textile trade.

The issues that we have before us today are large issues, and very important issues. But even large issues can be considered in a simple way, and I am going to try to do that presently. Now, what is the situation facing us? The situation is that here we have rising prices of cloth. Here we have middlemen making excessive profits.

Shri K. C. Sodhia (Sagar): Are not the industrialists doing it?

Shri V. B. Gandhi: Now, both these are undesirable developments, this development of rising prices of cloth as well as this opportunity for middlemen to make undeserved profits, and something must be done. To meet this situation, what have Government done? The Government have come forward with this Bill. This Bill is called the Central Excises and Salt (Amendment) Bill, 1956. This Bill has a limited objective. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is clearly stated that the objective is just to mop up these excess profits. Nowhere is mention made of the larger issue of control of prices. However, in his speech the Finance Minister has allowed himself the hope that perhaps through these increased excise duties, he would be able to have some influence over the rise in prices. I might as well say here, so far as my personal opinion is concerned, that in this case he is being a little too optimistic, and it may be that his hope may prove some kind of a wishful thinking, however well-considered the Bill may be in its objective.

Now, the House has rightly given much more of its time to a consideration of measures, for checking the rise in prices even than for mopping up the profits. We know that this rise in the price of cloth is caused by two factors. One is that people have so much more money.....

Shri B. S. Murthy: Who said?

Shri V. B. Gandhi: I say that. He may not. People have so much more money to spend on cloth. The other is that, situated as we are, committed as we are to certain policies of planning, we are not in a position immediately to increase production. Therefore, for some time we have to bear through this period which may appear as the period of helplessness, and yet it is a price we have to pay for our being committed to a planned economy.

Now, what can Government do? Government, of course, can come forward with some kind of measures to regulate the quantity of money in the hands of the people. Government, of course, can come forward and change their present policy of restrictive production of mill cloth. But these are issues which certainly we do not expect to find a place in a Bill of this kind, which purports to be a Bill for Central excises and salt amendment. Now, the Government certainly are not prevented from coming before this House with another Bill, frankly and fully dealing with this larger issue of checking the rise in prices of cloth. There are all kinds of measures which are open to the Government to take for checking this rise in prices. I think one hon. Member referred to encouragement of public savings. Then other measures are there, a measure like imposition of physical controls, a measure like rationing and price control, a measure like imposition of excess profits tax etc. These are all there in the armoury of the Government and in due time, Government are sure to make such use of these as they can and come before this House with their recommendations on these points. These are policy matters. Government have not yet disclosed them. But I would say that Government cannot get away from this responsibility to come before this House at an early date and declare their policy on these larger issues, in which the House has so manifestly expressed greater interest than in this limited objective of just mopping up the profits of middlemen.

[Shri V. B. Gandhi]

Even in this limited objective, how far are Government going to succeed? To my way of thinking, the Government will have or will achieve its objective only partially. What is actually going to happen is that even with this very ingenious expedient of flexible rates—with power in the hands of the Government to make the rates flexible—the increased duties will continue to chase prices and dealers and middlemen will always take the chances, because they will be the first to take the step of increasing the prices, and Government can only follow with increased duties; and in between, the dealers will reap their unholy or undeserved profits. So that is one shortcoming in this policy.

Then there can be more than one opinion on the question whether these duties will be passed on to the consumer. I belong to the view that a substantial portion of these duties will in due course be passed on to the consumer. But because of that, I do not think there is good reason why we should not try, we should not have this measure and we should not take some steps immediately.

And finally the hope which the Government entertain of influencing prices ultimately depends on the unpredictable behaviour of the consumer, I mean the hope that prices will ultimately rise only up to a point and no further, where consumer resistance will come in. I do not think we are on very firm ground so far as that is concerned.

Therefore, as I said, there is no reason why we should not try. The situation calls for immediate measures and this is one of the effective measures that we can have at hand, and therefore, I support this measure for what it is worth.

The Minister of Home Affairs and Heavy Industries (Pandit G. B. Pant): I have to apologise to the House for intervening in this debate.

The apology is two-fold: firstly because, ordinarily, I would not intrude upon a field which does not ordinarily come within my normal purview, and secondly because I was not here when hon. Members delivered their speeches, and I am really not fully acquainted with what has been said. But there are certain salient features which have already been mentioned, to which I would, even at the risk of repetition, venture to invite the attention of hon. Members.

The present position with regard to cloth is, I think, almost unmistakably obvious. There has been considerable increase in production in recent months. In fact, during the month of July last, we were able to produce the largest quantity that we had perhaps ever done in recent years. In spite of the fact that production has been increasing the stocks have been dwindling progressively. The mills had less in their stocks than they usually had formerly. They have now normally no more than a fortnight's production with them. Otherwise, they used to have at least a month's production in stock.

The *per capita* consumption of cloth has also happily increased. It has gone up to 16·8 yds. per head. So far as the increase in *per capita* consumption goes, it is a matter for satisfaction. We all are interested in raising the standard of life of the people and it is desirable that they should consume more of cloth and use other goods than they had been doing in the past. So far, what I have said is, I think, undisputable.

Now comes the question as to how we are going to face the problems. The demand has outstripped the supply. Our capacity of further expansion is limited. We cannot immediately produce more cloth. It is not possible to use any trick for adding to the cloth immediately and forthwith. The Industries and Commerce Minister, who is now the Finance Minister, has taken a series of mea-

tures in order to increase the output of cloth in the country. But it must necessarily take some time. You cannot get out of the hat the moment you shout for it. So you have to allow that process to bear the maximum fruit of which it is capable.

The question that the House has to address itself to is this: that if the demand has outstripped the supply and if the cloth trade is making iniquitous, unreasonable and excessive profits, then, what should be done to meet the situation. We have also to remember two other aspects. One, because of the rise in the price of cloth in the country, the manufacturer is not interested in sending cloth abroad; but, it is essential that cloth should be exported so that we may be able to earn foreign exchange. Our Plan cannot work unless we have the minimum foreign exchange necessary for purchasing and importing the essential machines and plants which we need for the implementation of our schemes. Then, we all want to encourage the production of cloth by handlooms, and also to provide employment for the largest number. So, if the price of cloth goes a little higher, these incidental advantages are bound to accrue. We can hope that there will be a greater stimulus for exporting cloth to foreign countries and thus we might be able to have more in the form of foreign exchange than we would otherwise get.

Again, a larger number may be employed in plying the handlooms as the difference between the price of cloth turned out by the handloom and that coming out of the machine will be greater than it is today. So, even if there was a slight increase in the price of cloth, then, that would not altogether lead to untoward results all round. I do not say that it will not have some effect on consumption; it will discourage consumption where consumption is not needed. So, it will have these advantages too. If the demand has out-stripped the supply, we have to find some sort of expedient to meet this difficult situation.

We might, perhaps, introduce the system of controls; but, after the experience that we had of controls, I think, nobody would like the revival of that system. It led to a certain amount of demoralisation in our economic life and it also created a number of other problems such as those of blackmarketing which have been causing headache even to this day. So, if we could possibly avoid that, we must do so.

Then, again, controls have not ordinarily encouraged production. They have resulted in the shrinkage of production. So, controls, as a long-range policy should not be welcomed in increasing production. If possible, we have to avoid that. Even if those engaged in the cloth business are making unreasonable profits and the consumer is made to pay more than he ought to have been asked to, we have to find some way out.

Now, it has been suggested that we could have imposed excess profits tax. That is another thing that could have been thought of. But the point is this. The increase today is not in the price at which cloth is sold by the mill-owner but even more in the price that is charged by the dealer, wholesaler or retailer. If you charge excess profits tax on the mill-owner, you do not mop up the excessive profits that the wholesaler or retailer is making. He is today charging a heavy price and, to that extent, imposing a burden on the consumer which would continue even if you were to charge excess profits duty on the manufacturer. You cannot charge excess profits duty on the wholesaler or the retailer. That is not the part of the scheme. So, you have to tackle the man who is making such profits and, for that, you have to impose a duty.

This duty has been imposed in such a way that we expect that at least a major part of it will be recovered out of the excess profits that these people are making, so that the burden on the consumer, if at all, must be very much less than the duty

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

that we are imposing. We say that we can find some fool-proof formula which will save the consumer completely. But one cannot say whether such a formula can be put forward with confidence. Even as it is, there is no doubt that the facts being as they are the consumer will not have to pay even the bulk of this levy. It is expected that it will come out of the excess profits.

4 P.M.

Shri S. S. More: How, and where is the guarantee?

Pandit G. B. Pant: There is no guarantee except the guarantee that the laws of economics work.

Some Hon. Members: No, no. (Interruption).

Pandit G. B. Pant: If they do not work, then merely by saying that they will not, we cannot overturn the chariot at all. It is after all on expectation, and considering the circumstances, we expect that there is a limit. What is the position today? I would put one simple question, and it is this. Does the trader or the manufacturer refrain from charging the highest price that he wishes to out of consideration for you or for me?

Shri S. S. More: No.

Pandit G. B. Pant: When he is charging the highest price that he can, if he has to charge a higher price, he thinks that he will not be able to sell as much as he is selling today. You have admitted that he is charging the highest price. If he is charging the highest price, then he would not like to go to such an extent as to lose his customer. He has to keep within certain limits. That is the law of economics. What those limits should exactly be it is difficult to say. After all at some stage.....

Shri S. S. More: When the demand is inelastic, what is the position? (Interruption).

Pandit G. B. Pant: At some stage or other, the law of diminishing return sets in. You cannot go on raising prices. May I humbly submit that no manufacturer or trader ordinarily charges less than what he can manage to do? If he is charging what he can, then obviously he cannot charge too much more, and if he does, then the consumption will go down; then the supply will outstrip the demand; then prices will fall and the entire process will work the other way. If what the hon. Member says is correct, that he is charging less than what he can, then if he charges more, that leads to a reduction in demand, and to that extent the demand outstrips the supply, then the price begins to fall; if the price begins to fall, then the whole process becomes more and more wholesome. Thus, we have to reach the point where the supply outstrips the demand, and the demand falls short of supply. That you can do only by adopting means like this. This is not, I may say, a measure for earning money; that is not the purpose. Of course, if money comes, it will be used for the good of the people. We have a Plan, an ambitious Plan, for which we have to raise, I think, about Rs. 1,000 crores in the course of four or five years. If we are to carry out the schemes as they have been outlined, money will have to be raised in various ways. There will have to be an integrated scheme of taxation. But here we are in the midst of the year and we are not putting forward a new scheme. Even this proposal would not have come but for the fact that there has been unexpected rise in the price of cloth and there has been an unexpected increase in the consumption of cloth. It is because of these difficulties that the conundrum should precede us, that we had to approach Parliament for the sanction of this proposal.

As I stated a little while ago, the consumption per capita has gone up to 16·8. Till last year the consumer was satisfied with, I think, 15·9 or something like that. But in the last

few months it has risen by about one yard per head. If the price goes up a little, then he may have to cut down his own quota from 16:9 to 16:6 or to 16:7. If he could manage with 15:9 last year, and if the circumstances combine together to induce him to reduce it from 16:9 to 16:7 ultimately he will gain, because the production will increase, supplies will become sufficient to meet the demands, and then the price level will come down. That is for which we have to work. Are we or are we not to work towards that end? That is the main objective of the levy. If the price goes on increasing, and that is bound to be, if no attempt is made to curb the demand today and to enlarge the supplies for the future, what will happen? That is the objective and that is the purpose behind this measure.

So far as sarees and dhotis of the coarse type are concerned, there is no increase whatever.

Shri S. S. More: Why not?

Pandit G. B. Pant: There is none.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: That is medium, not coarse.

Pandit G. B. Pant: There is none. We have throughout maintained this level of excise so far as sarees and dhotis are concerned. Even last time we did not make an increase.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Only for coarse.

Shri Kamath: For medium?

Pandit G. B. Pant: For the medium, it might be one anna, because for the medium we find there has been a very high increase in the price. For the medium quality, if you look at the figures, you will find that the rise in prices has been much more than for the coarse varieties. As the rise in the price has been much more than for the coarse varieties, evidently medium must pay a higher rate than coarse would be required to do. In the circumstances, that explains the position.

Then we have given a warning to those engaged in the trade that if they raise the price because of this levy, then they must be prepared for a higher tax, they must be prepared perhaps for other ways which will enable the Government to mop up every pie of what will go to them by way of any cess or levy on prices which may not be justified by the circumstances of equity and economy. That is a warning for the future which has been given in unequivocal terms.

I know that occasions like these do not often conduce to a sort of hallelujahs and songs. Proposals like these are not ordinarily welcomed. It is not in the nature of legislators to welcome proposals of this character, but I hope they will at least have a little patience to see how these proposals work (*Interruptions*). If they do not respond to the appeal to have a little patience, then I am afraid their attitude of mind is not quite rational.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Of the whole House.

Shri Kamath: Your side as well.

Pandit G. B. Pant: If that be so, if my colleagues on this side are speaking in the same tune as you are doing, then I may be wrong. That is all that I can say. But even though I may be wrong, I have to place before you the facts and to invite your attention to the compilation of the series of events that have happened and the results that must follow from them. That is, I think, of greater importance than what they say or what I say. So I would appeal to you to look at it as a measure of a disinflationary character. It is not a financial or fiscal measure, it is a measure designed to combat inflation. After all, whatever money goes to Government it does, to that extent, stop, hamper and serve as an antidote to inflation, in whatever form it might come. So, to that extent, it is obviously a disinflationary measure.

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

Then, further, by bringing the supply nearer the demand it again puts an end to the process of inflation. The whole purpose is to bring about a balance, an equilibrium between supply and demand, and till that stage is reached we have to adopt some expedient or other in order to see that men do not profiteer at the cost of the consumer, and if the consumer is to pay anything it goes back to him through the State and that is not pocketed by others to his detriment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava.

Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore): Can we have the benefit of the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister who I think, is mostly responsible for bringing forward this measure though the introduction of the Bill was done by the Finance Minister?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now we have to be content with the remarks of the hon. Minister who is in charge of the Bill.

Shri N. R. Muniswamy (Wandiwash): The hon. Prime Minister is ready to say something. Let us have the benefit of what he wants to say on this Bill.

Shri Kamath: A little later; say half an hour later.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : मैं खुशकिस्मत हूँ कि पेश्तर इसके कि मैं ने बोलना शुरू किया मुझे जनाब होम मिनिस्टर (गृहकार्य मंत्री) साहब ने जो कुछ फरमाया उसको सुनने का मौका मिला। उनको सुनने के बाद मैं यह समझा कि यह क्या मुसोबत है कि नये फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर (वित्त-मंत्री) का पहला बिल इस तरह का हो कि जिसकी वजह से हाउस में इतना वावैला हो। हम अपने साबिक आनरेबुल कामर्स मिनिस्टर (माननीय वाणिज्य मंत्री) को बहुत वर्षों से जानते हैं, वे बड़े रिसोर्सफुल (साधनपूर्ण) हैं और हमें उन पर पूरा

विश्वास है और कभी हमने यह नहीं देखा कि उन्होंने जो राय यहां पर जाहिर की हो उस पर इस कदर लोगों ने झगड़ा किया हो या इतना वावैला मचाया हो कि हमें उनकी बात मंजूर नहीं है। इसके अलावा जो कुदरती स्वाहिस किसी मिनिस्टर साहब की हो सकती है कि कामर्स मिनिस्ट्री से फाइनेंस मिनिस्ट्री में आये, ऐसे अच्छे मौके पर जब कोई आदमी तरक्की पाता है तो वह कपड़ा बांटता है, रोटी बांटता है और और तरह की चीजें करता है तो यह नामुमकिन था कि हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब, अगर उनको यह मजबूरी न होती तो ऐसा बिल लाते कि जो अपनी तरफ पर हर एक आइटम में जितनी बारीकियां हैं और जिनको कि हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने समझाया, वह इसके अंदर न होती और वह ऐसा बिल लाते जिसका कि लोग बगैर किमी रिजर्वेशन के दिल खोल कर स्वागत करते।

श्री वि० च० देशपांडे ने जो इस विषयक के सम्बन्ध में दलील दी उसके बारे में भी मैं एक लफ्ज़ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। यह कैसे मुमकिन है कि एक पापुलर पार्टी (लोक-प्रिय दल) जब कि एलेक्शन (निर्वाचन) नजदीक हों और मेरे लायक दोस्त कहते हैं कि उन्होंने जानबूझ कर ऐसे मौके पर यह बिल रक्खा है कि वोट देने वाले उन्हें वोट ही न दें। हमारे दोस्त कहते हैं कि यह कांग्रेस पार्टी जो हुकूमत में है, यह इतने धमंड में है कि यह किसी चीज की परवाह नहीं करती है। अपोजीशन (विरोधी) पार्टी (दल) वालों के मुंह से यह बात निकलना कि हुकमरा पार्टी वोटों की पर्वाह नहीं करती है और ऐसे मौके पर जब कि एलेक्शन नजदीक हो, हाउस खुद जान लेगा कि इसमें कितनी बुकअत (शक्ति) है। मैं अदब से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस नुक्तेनिगाह से मैं इस बिल को देखता हूँ वह बिलकुल जुदा है। मैं इस चीज को मानता हूँ जब कि हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब यह फरमाते

हैं कि सेकेंड फाइव इयर प्लान (द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना) हम कामयाबी के साथ नहीं चला सकते हैं जब तक कि कौमन मैन को हम टैक्स न करें और यह बात सही है और मैं उसको मानता हूँ। चुनावों के बाद पिछली दफा वह एक बिल लाये जो कांस्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) में तबदीली करता था, आज कांस्टीट्यूशन के अन्दर गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया (भारत सरकार) को पावर्स (शक्तियाँ) दी हुई थीं कि नैसेमेटोज आफ लाइफ (जीवन की आवश्यक वस्तुओं) पर अगर उनकी इजाजत न हो तो कोई लोकल गवर्नमेंट उन पर टैक्स नहीं लगा सकती, उस मीके पर मैंने अर्ज किया था कि मैं यह जानता हूँ कि जब तक कौमन मैन (जनसाधारण) पर टैक्स नहीं लगेगा यह फाइव इयर प्लान ठीक तरीके से नहीं चलेगा लेकिन उसके साथ हो मैंने यह भी अर्ज कर दिया था कि नोएस्ट रंग (निम्नतम वर्ग) पर अगर आप टैक्स लगायेंगे तो सिवाय इसके कि पापुलरली एलेक्टड (लोगों द्वारा निर्वाचित) लोग भी उसकी मुखालकत करें, इसके अलावा कोई दूसरी जोड़ नहीं होगी।

मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आज सुबह जब मैंने अखबार में पढ़ा कि इस देश में करीब डेढ़ करोड़ लोग ऐसे रहते हैं जो कि केवल पनौ और रूट्स पर रहते हैं तो मैं दंग रह गया। मैं नहीं समझता कि यह खबर कहां तक सही है लेकिन इस हकीकत से इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता कि आज भी हमारे देश में काफी बड़ी तादाद ऐसे लोगों की है जिनके कि पास पहनने को काफी कपड़े नहीं हैं। मुझे वह दिन याद है जब पूज्य महात्मा जो ने उड़ीसा के वास्ते लिखा था कि वहां इतनी ज्यादा गुरबत फैली हुई थी कि वहां की औरतें शीपड़ियों से बाहर नहीं आती थीं क्योंकि वे बेचारी अन्दर नंगी बैठी रहती थीं। मैं उन चीजों को भूल नहीं सकता। अब हमें देखना यह है कि इस ६ वर्ष के अन्दर किस कदर हमने तरबकी की है और किस कदर आगे बढ़ गये हैं।

अंग्रेजों के जमाने में हम कहा करते थे कि इस देश में ३० परसेंट आदमी ऐसे हैं जो कि दो वक्त पर्याप्त भोजन करना नहीं जानते और मैं समझता हूँ कि आज भी हमारे देश में बहुत से लोग होंगे जिनको कि दो वक्त खाना मयस्सर नहीं होता होगा। एक गांव के लेंडलेस लेबर (भूमिरहित मजदूर) की औसत आमदनी १०४ सालाना बसलायी जाती है—और रोजाना आमदनी २ $\frac{1}{3}$ से ५ आने या ५ आने से दस आने तक कही जाती है।

अब यह जो पर कैपिटा १५ गज कपड़े का मियार है उसको जरा ऐनालाइज करके देखें। ५.६ गज की तो एक धोती हो जाती है और साल में अगर दो कुरते बनवा लिये तो १० गज उसमें लग गया और तिस पर भी ओढ़ने बिछाने का कपड़ा जाड़े गर्मी के वास्ते चाहिये, गरीब आदमी को यह सब मयस्सर ही नहीं आता। इसके बरअक्स आप देखें कि जो वैल आफ (घन्यादय) लोग हैं मसलन् हम लोगों का एवेंज कपड़े का कितना होता होगा, मैं समझता हूँ कि हम लोग १००, २०० गज से कम कपड़ा खर्च न करते होंगे और जो और घनिक लोग हैं वे इससे भी ज्यादा कपड़ा खर्च करते हैं। लेकिन इस देश के एक गरीब आदमी का जो कपड़े का औसत है वह इस कदर कम है कि उसको तन ढांकने के वास्ते कपड़ा नहीं है। आज भी आप गांवों में जाकर देखिये वहां पर आपको लड़के नंग घड़ंग मिलेंगे। आपको ऐसे चीथड़े और फटे कपड़ों में लोग अपना तन ढांके हुए मिलेंगे कि जिसको आप बर्दास्त नहीं कर सकेंगे।

अब अगर होम मिनिस्टर साहब जिन्होंने कि इस सारे सवाल को हमें समझाया है, मुझ से पूछें कि मैं उनको कोई और अर्थ हल सुझाऊं तो मैं उनको कोई हल नहीं बतला सकता। मेरे पास कोई हल नहीं है लेकिन एक बात मैं जानता हूँ कि यह फाइव इयर प्लान आपका सर्वसफुल (सफल) हो या अनसर्वसफुल (असफल) हो, मैं नहीं चाहता

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव]

कि जो गरीब आदमी है और लोएस्ट रंग (निम्नतम वर्ग) पर है वह भूखा मरे या कपड़ा न पहने। अलबत्ता जो लोएस्ट रंग से उपर हों उनसे आप कितनी ही सैक्रिफाइस करने के लिये कहें, मुझे उसमें कोई ऐतराज नहीं होगा। आपने जो यह ४२०० रुपये की टैक्सबुल लिमिट (करयोग्य सीमा) रक्खी है इसको आप और कम कर दें, मैं उसमें आपके साथ हूँ और जिस हद तक कि उनका गुजर चल सके और रोटी खा सकें और कपड़ा पहन सकें, उस हद तक कम किये जाने में मैं आपके साथ सोलहों आने हूँ क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि लोगों को सैक्रिफाइस करनी होगी अगर यह पंचवर्षीय योजना हमें कामयाब बनानी है।

मैं इस बात पर बड़ा खुश हूँ कि धोती साड़ियों पर टैक्स नहीं लगाया गया है और मैं आपको इसके लिये बधाई देता हूँ कि आपने धोतियों और साड़ियों को इस टैक्स से माफ कर दिया है लेकिन एक गरीब मिडिल क्लास का आदमी जो धोती के अलावा और दूसरे कपड़े पहनता है वह कपड़ा मीडियम क्लास (मध्यम श्रेणी का कपड़ा) में आता है और मीडियम क्लास के बारे में आप फरमाते हैं कि आप उस पर टैक्स लगा रहे हैं उस पर आप बड़ी मुसीबत बा रहे हैं

श्री० रणवीर सिंह (रोहताक) :
बोग धोती का कुर्ता बनवायेंगे।

पंडित ठाकुर दास भार्गव : अगर धोती का कुर्ता बनवायेंगे तो उनकी वही हालत होने वाली है जो हालत उन गरीब औरतों की होती थी जिनकी कि बाबत मैंने कुछ देर पहले डिस्क किया था। धोती साड़ी की कहीं कीमत मुकर्रर नहीं है वह भी स्वाह टैक्स इस पर लगे या न लगे गरीब आदमी को बहुत मंहगी मिलेगी।

आपको यह देखना चाहिये कि जो लोएस्ट रंग पर है या ऐन उसके ऊपर है उसको

और हार्डशिप न हो और जैसे कि विलायत में और चीन में गरीब आदमियों के लिये एक खास तरह के कपड़े बनते हैं और वह उनको सस्ते दामों में मिलते हैं और उस क्रिसम के कपड़े पर टैक्स नहीं लगाया जाता, अगर इस तरह की कोई व्यवस्था यहां पर की जाय जिससे गरीब लोगों को कपड़े के मामले में राहत मिले और उनको मुनासिब और सस्ते दामों में कपड़ा मिल सके जिससे वे अपना तन दांक सके तो आपकी जितनी रीजनिंग (युक्तियां) हैं मैं उनको मानने को तैयार हूँ। आपकी जो यह रीजनिंग है कि इस मीपिंग अप का अलर कंज्यूमर्स पर नहीं पड़ेगा, वह मेरी समझ में नहीं आयी क्योंकि जैसा आज सुबह पार्टी के एक तजुबकार दोस्त ने बतलाया कि तीन चार महीने के बाद यह सारा का सारा टैक्स कंज्यूमर्स (उपभोक्ताओं) के ऊपर चला जायगा। मुझे अगर यह तसल्ली होती कि यह टैक्स कंज्यूमर्स पर नहीं पड़ेगा तो जैसा मेरे भाई भागवत शा ने कहा, मैं उस से इत्फाक करता और इस को सपोर्ट (सन्थन) करता। मैं खुद कहता कि आप का टैक्स बिलकुल ठीक है। लेकिन मुझे यकीन नहीं है कि यह टैक्स कंज्यूमर्स पर नहीं पड़ेगा। दूसरों पर यह टैक्स जाता तो मुझे परवाह नहीं थी, लेकिन यह उन लोगों पर जा रहा है जो कि टैक्स देने के इबिल नहीं हैं, और उन लोगों को इस से बड़ी तकलीफ होगी। आज वह यह महसूस नहीं कर सकते कि क्या हमारा सेकेन्ड फाइव इमर प्लान है। वह नहीं जानते कि हमारी सरकार क्या करने जा रही है और क्या कर रही है। आज तो हालत बही है कि हिसाब ज्यों का त्यों, कुनबा डूबा क्यों। आप के इन्फ्रीज के ऐवरेजेंज (औसत) से उस को मतलब नहीं है, वह वाकिफ नहीं है कि देश में पैदावार बढ़ रही है या क्या हो रहा है। आज वह ऐसी हालत में नहीं है कि जरा भी ज्यादा बोझ उठा सके। गवर्नमेंट को

इन हालात का खयाल कर के उन को तकलीफ नहीं होने देना चाहिये। आज मैं देखता हूँ कि हमारे अशोक मेहता साहब ने एक तरह से इस गवर्नमेंट को सपोर्ट किया और कहा कि मैं खुश हूँ क्योंकि इससे हमारी सेकेन्ड फाइव इयर् प्लैन को मदद मिलेगी। मैं भी अपने कंविक्लान्स के मुताबिक अर्ज करता हूँ कि हम सब उस हद् तक इसको सपोर्ट करने के लिये तैयार हैं जिस हद् तक कि आप को सेकेन्ड फाइव इयर् प्लैन का ताड़ुक है। मैं सेकेन्ड फाइव इयर् प्लैन के लिये किसी भी हद् तक जाने को तैयार हूँ, लेकिन इस हद् तक जाने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ जहाँ तक कि यह गरीब से गरीब आदमी को एफेक्ट करता है। जहाँ तक गरीब जनता के खाने पीने को टैक्स करने का सवाल है, जहाँ तक उस की ऐंशियल्स आफ लाइफ को टैक्स करने का सवाल है, आप एक हद् कायम कर दीजिये कि इस हद् के आगे हम नहीं जायेंगे अगर आप ऐसा कर सकें तो हमें कोई फिक्र नहीं है, हम समझेंगे कि कम से कम उस आदमी पर असर नहीं पड़ेगा जो कि यह टैक्स देने के काबिल नहीं है। बाकी पर अगर असर पड़ता है, तो वह किसी न किसी तरह से उस को बर्दाश्त कर लेंगे। लेकिन आज आप वह हद् भी मुकर्रर नहीं कर रहे हैं। मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले नौ वर्षों में हम ने उस गरीब आदमी को कहां तक सहूलियत पहुंचाई है, कहां तक उस की हालत को ठीक किया है। जब हम एम्प्लायमेंट के फिगर्स को देखते हैं कि हम कितने आदमियों को ऐसा एम्प्लायमेंट दे सके हैं जिस से वह अपना गुजारा कर सकें, तो देखते हैं कि हम वह चीज बिल्कुल नहीं कर सके हैं। इस में हमारा कसूर नहीं है, आहिस्ता आहिस्ता चीजें बढ़ेंगी, एक दिन में सारी परेशानियां खत्म नहीं हो सकती, लेकिन हमें फीक्ट को रिकग्नाइज करना चाहिये कि आज जो गरीब आदमी है उस की एकानमिक हालत में तब्दीली नहीं आई है, जब तक

उस को एकानमिक हालत में तब्दीली नहीं होगी तब तक वह ऐंप्रिंशिएट (अनुभव) नहीं कर सकता कि हम अपने मुल्क में क्या करने जा रहे हैं ! हमने निहायत अच्छे अलफाब में अपनी बातों को रक्खा, लेकिन जब तक हर आदमी को उस का नतीजा नहीं दिखाई पड़ेगा तब तक वह कैसे हमारी बात पर यकीन कर सकेगा।

मैं एक या दो चीजें और कहना चाहता हूँ। यहां हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर (प्रधान मंत्री) साहब, होम मिनिस्टर (गृहकार्य मंत्री) साहब और फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर (वित्त-मंत्री) साहब सभी तशरीफ रखते हैं। अगर हो सके तो दशहरा और दीवाली ऐसे मौकों पर इस टैक्स को न लगाइये। आप सब साहबान दशहरा और दीवाली में शामिल होते हैं। जब दशहरा और दीवाली के मौकों पर इस टैक्स का बाम्ब शेल गरीब आदमियों के पास पहुंचेगा तो वह यही समझेंगे कि उन के उपर गवर्नमेंट ने नया टैक्स लगा दिया। हर आदमी पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर नहीं है जो कि फाइव इयर् प्लैन को ग्रहमित्यत को समझता है, कामन मैन तो यही समझेगा कि गवर्नमेंट ने हम को इतना नुक्सान पहुंचाया कि हमारे कपड़ा पहनने पर रोक लगाई है। मामूली लोग इस चीज को हमारी तरह से न देख कर और तरह से देखेंगे और गवर्नमेंट अनगुलर होगी। मैं जानता हूँ कि हम को और गवर्नमेंट को अनपापुलैरिटी की परवाह नहीं करना चाहिये अगर देश के हिंदू के लिये काम करने का ऐसा नतीजा मिले लेकिन कम से कम ऐसे शुभ मौकों पर जैसे कि दीवाली और पूजा के त्योहार हैं, इस टैक्स को न्याय न किया जाय। लोगों को थोड़ी सांस लेने दीजिये। जिस आदमी पर ऐसे मौके पर असर पड़ेगा वह आप को इस के लिये मुबारकबाद नहीं देगा।

जहाँ तक मीडियम और कोर्स क्लाथ (मध्यम श्रेणी और मोटे कपड़े) का सवाल है, मुझे याद है, दो बरस हुए मौजूदा फाइनेन्स मिनि-

[पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब]

स्टर (वित्त मंत्री) ज़ाहब के प्रिडेसेसर (पूर्वाधिकारी) बजट के मौके पर जब कोर्स क्लाय पर ड्यूटी बढ़ा रहे थे तो उन पर जोर डाला गया कि वह चीज कम कर दी जानी चाहिये क्योंकि उस का असर गरीबों पर पड़ता है। तो उन्होंने इसी बिना पर उस को कम किया था कि वह नहीं चाहते थे कि किसी कल्टिवेटर (कृषक) या मामूली आदमी पर बोझ बढ़े। आप के फाइव इन्चर प्लैन के सफहा सफहा पर लिखा हुआ है कि जब फूड और क्लाय और दूसरी रोजमर्रा के इस्तेमाल की चीजों के भाव ठीक नहीं होंगे उस वक्त तक फाइव इन्चर प्लैन कामयाब नहीं होगी। जहां तक रेट्स के कम होने के बारे में आप के आर्गुमेंट (तर्क) का सवाल है, जितना वजन उस में है, वह दुस्त है, लेकिन उस की भी एक हद्द है। उसको ऐप्रिशिएट करते हुये मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि जैसा कि श्री बंसल ने बताया आप कल्टिवेटर्स की प्रोड्यूस की कीमत को कम करना चाहते हैं, मैं भी चाहता हूँ कि वह कम हो, गरीब आदमी के खर्च में कमी हो और कल्टिवेटर्स को नुकसान न हो। लेकिन एक तरफ तो आप कल्टिवेटर्स की पैदा की हुई प्रोड्यूस की कीमत कम करते हैं और दूसरी तरफ आप कपड़ा मंहंगा करते हैं, तो उस का बजट कैसे बैलेन्स होगा। अगर आप यह उम्मीद करते हैं कि तीन या चार महीनों के बाद आप अपनी पालिसी को बदल देंगे या भाव कम होने पर आप इस टैक्स को हटा देंगे, तो मुझे इस के मानने में कोई खास उच्च नहीं होगा, लेकिन आपने एक लपज भी ऐसा नहीं फरमाया जिस से पता चले कि अगर ऐसा मौका आये कि भाव ठीक हो जायें तो आप इस टैक्स को कम कर देंगे। अगर आप यही फरमा देते कि सिर्फ थोड़े दिनों के लिये आपने यह तरकीब निकाली है, तब भी हम को यकीन आता कि यह चीज ठीक है, लेकिन ऐसा आप ने कहीं नहीं कहा है। मैं जानता हूँ कि एक दफा लगा का टैक्स कमी कम नहीं हुआ करता,

कोई गवर्नमेंट उस को कम नहीं कर सकती, क्योंकि उस की जरूरतें ऐसी होती हैं कि वह टैक्सों की कम करने के काबिल नहीं रहती। इसलिये मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि कम से कम आप एक चीज प्रोनाउंस कर दीजिये कि आप दशहरा और दीवाली के मौके पर इस टैक्स को नहीं लगायेंगे। हालांकि मैं जानता हूँ कि ऐसा करने से जो आप की मंशा है वही खत्म हो जाती है, लेकिन इस दुनिया के अन्दर साइकालोजी (मानसिक दशा) और सेंटिमेंट्स (भावनायें) भी एक ऐसी चीज है जिस को हमें वैल्यू (महत्व समझना) करना चाहिये। इसलिये आप दीवाली, दशहरा और संक्रान्ति ऐसे मौकों पर मेहरबानी कर के यह जरूर कर दीजिये

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I must bring to the notice of the hon. Members that I have been making appeal frequently to keep silent, but they have not been heeded. I solicit the co-operation of the Members in maintaining silence. Let us hear the hon. Member who is speaking.

पंडित ठाकुर दास भागंब : दूसरी चीज मैं यह अर्ज कर रहा था कि आप को इस डिस्कशन (चर्चा) का जवाब भी देना है, मेहरबानी कर के उस वक्त कह दीजिये कि कम्यूलेशन (बाध्यता) की वजह से यह टैक्स लगा रहे हैं, यह टैक्स हमेशा के वास्ते नहीं है, जब मुसीबत हट जायेगी और हमारी सारी कोशिशें जो हैं जब वह कामयाब हो जायेंगी और भाव नीचे आ जायेंगे, जिस लेवल पर हम उनको लाना चाहते हैं, यानी जो गरीब आदमी का बजट है वह बैलेन्स हो जायेगा, तो यह टैक्स कायम नहीं रहेगा।

मैं आपकी खिदमत में एक चीज बढ़े दुःख के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ। परसों हमारे रुबरू वह बिल था जिस के अन्दर हैंडलूम का जिक्र था। आज भी हैंडलूम का जिक्र हुआ है। मैं जानता हूँ कि जिस वक्त आपको आर्गुमेंट करना होता है, आप

हैंडलूम (हथकरघा) के हक में बहस कर देते हैं और कह देते हैं कि हैंडलूम की प्रोड्यूस (उत्पादन) बढ़ जायेगी। हम सब चाहते हैं कि हैंडलूम की प्रोड्यूस बढ़े। लेकिन जिस बेसिस (आधार) पर गांधी जी ने हमारे हैंडलूम को बढ़ाया और जिस तरकीब से वह इस को चलाना चाहते थे, उस पर आज तक गवर्नमेंट कमिटेड नहीं है। कल आचार्य कृपालानी ने कहा था कि अगर आप सचमुच चाहते हैं कि सारे गांव स्वावलम्बी बनें तो ग्रसल में यही एक सोल्यूशन है जो कि ग्रसली सोल्यूशन (हल) कहा जा सकता है। लेकिन मैं जानता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट की सारी पालिसी (नीति) इस बारे में साफ नहीं है। वह दोहरी बातें करते हैं। एक तरफ तो वह हैंडलूम को तरक्की देना चाहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ वह स्पिंडल्ल को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं। यह दोनों पालिसीज एक दूसरे के खिलाफ हैं। इन दोनों को एक बेसिस पर ला कर रक्वा जाय तभी काम चल सकता है। एक तरफ यह कहना कि स्पिंडल्ल बढ़ाना चाहते हैं और मिल का कपड़ा चलाना चाहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ यह कहना कि कपड़े को टैक्स करने से हैंडलूम बढ़ जायेगा वह दोनों हमारे लिये पैराडाक्सेज हैं जिस को समझना मुश्किल है। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे फाइनेन्स मिनिस्टर साहब इस पर गौर करेंगे।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Before I call upon the next hon. Member, I should like to say this. Initially, there were only two hours fixed for this Bill. Then, there was an option, at the discretion of the Speaker, to increase it by one hour. A demand was made that the whole day be spent on this Bill. That was the maximum that the hon. Members asked for or demanded. So, at least we should stick to that maximum that the hon. Members had asked for, and we must try to finish the discussion by 6 O'clock today. That shall have to be done. Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan.

Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan:
I thank you for giving me an

opportunity to say a few words on this Bill. To say that when this Bill, when it was published in the newspapers a couple of days ago, gave many of us a shock, is to put it very mildly indeed. After hearing the very pleasant news of the new Finance Minister taking over charge, the first Bill that he brings to this House is this Bill which, I know, will bring great hardship to the middle-class people of this country. I have listened with great interest and attention to the statements made by the hon. Finance Minister as well as the hon. Home Minister. I am no economist nor do I know much about statistics, but I do know the country; I know the people of the country and I do know what a great amount of anxiety prevails among the people. Just before the three very important festivals of this country—Dusserah, Deepavali and Pongal, which is the most important festival in the south—when in every household, poor, rich or middle-class, they have to buy clothes not only for themselves and their children, but for everyone depending on them, to bring this Bill which is going to impose more taxes on cloth seems to be a very unwise step. I am surprised that the Finance Minister, with all his experience of the country and his great knowledge and extreme wisdom, should have thought it proper to bring this Bill just now before the House. In spite of all that has been said that this is going to mop up a certain amount of excess profits that the industrialists are making, I am sorry I am not convinced. I am going to plead more for the middle-class people, the Government servants in the lower income group and the "white-collared people" like doctors, nurses and lawyers. Their income is not much; they are the people who are going to suffer more today, because the rich people can always buy cloth at whatever price they may be sold and the very poor people as a rule do not use as much cloth as the middle-class people. The middle-class people have to dress decently; they have to send their children to schools neatly dressed and therefore,

[Shrimati Ammu Swaminadhan]

they have to buy more cloth than the poor people.

Prices of foodstuffs and edible oils have gone up. In fact, the prices of all the consumer goods which are necessary for all of us to live have gone up and now the price of cloth is going to shoot up like anything. It is very nice to hear the Finance Minister say that this particular Bill would not raise the prices of cloth and that prices would go up in any case. That is not the excuse to give a push to the upward trend of the prices of cloth. It is another matter if the industrialists want to rise the prices of cloth. But even there Government should have some machinery to control and check the rising prices. How can we go to the country and say to the people, "from tomorrow you have to pay extra price for the cloth you are wearing, because Government needs money". The Prime Minister is always telling us, and very rightly too, that we must enthruse the people of this country to co-operate in the implementation of the second Five Year Plan and co-operate with the Government in making this country a Welfare State. If the Government feel that it is absolutely necessary to have more money, would it not be right for the Government to use their own machinery and do propaganda among the people of this country saying, "we want to make this country a Welfare State; we want people to have a better standard of living" and then say, "please give us a little more money by way of tax or buy less cloth", if there is shortage of cloth? Tell them to buy less cloth, till more cloth is produced in the country. I feel that among peoples all over the world, our people in India are more reasonable than anybody else. I am sure if the Government comes out with such a scheme saying that people should not buy so much cloth and they should be prepared to pay towards the implementation of the second Five Year Plan, either by direct taxation or in any other way, I am sure our people will do that. But, I feel this would be really

victimising the people. You will be antagonising the people of the country. Certainly, that is not what our Government want to do. When we are at the beginning of the second Five Year Plan, we want the enthusiastic and willing support of everybody and the co-operation of the people of this country. The Plan is going to be discussed in a few days' time in this House.

It is said that coarse cloth is not taxed. People who know statistics have told us that coarse cloth is not produced so much. It is the medium cloth that is mostly produced and that is the cloth which people buy more, except, of course, the people who wear khadi. But, how many people wear khadi and handloom cloth? Leaving dhotis and sarees, a large majority of the people use mill-made cloth for shirts and other clothings. It is not because the people of this country have more money that they have been buying more cloth. One of the reasons is increase in population every year. Also, today people feel that they need more cloth than they did a few years ago. I can speak for South India—the part of the country I know very well, especially Malabar. Those very people who used less cloth formerly now feel that they need more cloth and they purchase a larger quantity of cloth, in spite of so many difficulties.

All the Members who have spoken today seem to feel that this is not the right kind of tax to be brought just now and I do beg of the Finance Minister to withdraw the Bill entirely or at least the tax on medium cloth. I would like to tell him that in South India, when we are taking up something new, we always do something for what is known as "Drishhti Parihar" or "Nagar Lagai". I hope that this will be "Drishhti Parihar" for him and his term of office will meet with great success. We all wish him great success in the new portfolio which he has taken up. I am sure he will remember that democracy functions through the majority of the people and the

majority of the Members in this House feel that this Bill should not be passed now.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: It is somewhat surprising that Member after Member has spoken against this Bill. I am afraid there is some misunderstanding about the scope of this Bill. Hon. Members, I am afraid, have not given attention to para 4 of the Statement of Objects and Reasons where it is said:

"It is not intended, however, immediately to enforce these rates to the full extent. Some increases are being made now and it is the intention that a constant watch be kept on the movement of prices and to the extent that excessive profits are made in relation to the fair ex-mill price as worked out on the basis of the formula of the Tariff Commission, an increasing percentage of such profits may be taken away as excise duty."

That is all that is intended now. Whether the Government will immediately enforce the excise duty to the full extent is the matter for consideration. I am afraid, that is not the intention. If they are going to impose it straightway.....

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): They have already imposed it.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: But not to the full extent. They have only taken the powers to impose it to the fullest extent. If they impose it to the fullest extent, I can understand the objection that the prices will go up. But this is only a measure to give the powers to the Central Government to regulate and control the situation.

Shri B. S. Murthy: How?

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: By varying the duty. The duties proposed in the Bill are four annas for coarse and medium cloth and six annas for fine and superfine cloth. It is not intended, however, to immediately enforce it to the fullest extent. It is

only to watch the price fluctuations and to regulate the duty accordingly. That is what the Bill intends to do. It is stated that full powers are there but they will be exercised only when the situation demands.

A point has been raised by my hon. friend, Mr. Morarka, that the whole of this duty will be passed on to the consumer. If that is so, the very purpose of the Bill will be defeated. There is no gainsaying the fact that if the contention of Mr. Morarka is correct, it is a challenge.....

Shri Morarka: What is the past experience?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House is meant for hearing everybody's views. There may be honest difference of opinion. We should give him this opportunity to speak his mind.

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: If that is so, it is a challenge to the Finance Minister and it is for him to explain how this duty will not be transmitted entirely to the consumer.

It is somewhat unfortunate that the Finance Minister, while explaining the Bill, did not tell us at what point there was excess profit. Is it at the producer stage or is it at the wholesale stage or the retail stage? Further, he did not explain fully at what stage this duty will operate for mopping up of profits. Now, unless the object of mopping up of profits is achieved, I am afraid, the object will be defeated as the prices will go up. Further, the hon. Minister did not explain fully the mechanism by which this excess profit is thought to be mopped up. As I find it, the profit seems to be at the wholesale stage and this can be mopped up only if the excess duty is imposed on the manufacturer so that the goods may be sold to the wholesaler plus the excise duty. The question is whether he will transmit it again to the retailer and the retailer will transmit it to the consumer. What exactly is the mechanism by which the price will be controlled is a matter in which the Minister will have to

[Shri S. V. Ramaswamy]

bestow his attention and see that the object is achieved.

The question has been repeatedly put from the opposite side as well as this side why this industry has been singled out, that is, the textile industry alone has been singled out. There is no gainsaying the fact that in no other industry is there so much profit as in the textile industry. The profits are so great that I am wondering whether the new Finance Minister will not think of nationalising the textile industry. There is so much profit in it that it is worth consideration. But as the figures in the tabulated form clearly indicate, there is enormous profit. The table given at page 2 will disclose this. For coarse cloth, for an increase under the cotton of 75 per cent. there is an increase of 7 per cent. in the price of the cloth. Again, in the case of medium cloth, for a 4 per cent. increase in the case of cotton, there is an increase of 18 per cent. in the price of cloth. With regard to fine cloth, for an increase of 3.5 per cent. in the price of cotton, there again is an increase in the price of cloth to the extent of 18 per cent. With regard to super-fine, though the price of cotton has increased only by 6.5 per cent., the price of cloth has risen by 23 per cent. Clearly, a case has been made out that there is excess profit in this trade.

Now the question is which is the best method for mopping up of profits. The methods may differ. Members from the opposite side and this side have suggested that E.P.T. may be revived and other methods should be introduced by which the profits could be mopped up. But immediately and urgently when the prices are soaring high and when it is indicated clearly that the industry is making enormous profits and they are going to reap harvest during those three festivals which are coming up, I think there is no time for the Government to bring forth E.P.T. This is an emergency measure by which we are mopping up the profits which are clearly

indicated by the tabular statement. My hon. friend, Mr. Bansal, questioned whether these figures are correct. If the hon. Members are going to question this, in the absence of better figures, we must accept what the Government has given as correct figures. If those figures are true, there is no doubt that a case has been made out that the textile mill industry is making enormous profits.

I welcome this measure from another angle also. This is decidedly in favour of the handloom industry. So, I welcome this measure on behalf of the handloom industry because owing to the difference in price levels there will be a fillip given to the handloom industry. It has been suggested that the difference is so great that the subsidy given to the handloom industry may as well be removed. I would, on the other hand, suggest that out of the profits that you get of Rs. 17.5 crores, the subsidy to the handloom industry may be further enhanced so that the handloom will be on stronger foundation because, after all, if the mill cloth is going to be dear, it requires only little effort for the people to change their habits and go in for the handloom cloth and support the millions of people who are living by this cottage industry. Now if, as the Finance Minister expects, the handloom industry is to thrive I hope every handloom weaver will get 300 days work in the year. The Kanungo Committee said that they are getting only 200 days' work in the year. My contention is that it is on the high side. They are only getting 150 days' work every year. With this difference in price level, I hope enough work will be given to the handloom weavers so that they will have full employment.

But I fear there is one snag about it and that is the shortage of yarn supply. If the hon. Finance Minister could guarantee full supply of yarn, I have no doubt whatsoever, that the handloom industry will be able to supply all the demands in this coun-

try for cloth and this is the best opportunity for them to produce and satisfy the needs of this country. I hope the handloom industry will take full advantage of this.

Incidentally, I hope the Finance Minister will put aside for the time being the claim for powerlooms which was adumbrated by him as Minister for Commerce and Industry. I hope he will keep it in abeyance and, in the meantime, help the handloom industry by seeing that the pit looms and the throw shuttle looms are completely eliminated and the fly shuttle looms are introduced in the handloom industry so that the production may be more than doubled. I have no doubt whatsoever that this measure is of great help to the much neglected handloom industry and I fully welcome this measure because it will give a fillip to the handloom industry and I hope the Finance Minister will concentrate upon all measures, including the utilisation of the additional income that will be derived out of the excise duty, for helping the handloom industry to satisfy the needs and tests of the multifarious people from different parts of the country and thus stabilise the handloom industry and put it on a strong foundation.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: The first shot of Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, as a Finance Minister I am afraid, we will have to term as the first shot at the back of the people. I cannot but use these harsh terms because, on the very first day, when he innocuously introduced this measure before half a dozen people in this House, the reaction immediately of even a person like me who does not know very much of the intricacies of economics was that this measure was not going to be utilised for mopping up profits. Normally, in everyday life, what is it that we have seen? Every excise duty on every essential commodity has led to an increase in prices. The Home Minister who is a master at using subtleties of

expression and turn the table against his opponents, I am afraid, has made a bad case worse. Apparently, in economics, when demand oversteps production, we must raise the prices: that is exactly what he said, boils down to. But, he forgot one essential thing. That is, an essential commodity like rice, like oil, like cloth, this theory is absolutely fallacious. What is it that we have seen in my State of West Bengal? Price of rice rose to Rs. 40. But did people stop buying it? They had to buy it, because it was a question of life and death. We have heard during the course of this debate more than once that after all, there is a lot of money circulating in the country and people seem to have become rich according to the figures of *per capita* national wealth and to mop that up, we are going to impose this excise duty. But, what is it that we see? Every day during the last fortnight, I have received heart rending letters from middle class people from my State saying, Puja is coming we cannot buy clothes for our children. We cannot send our sons to school because they have no shirts on their backs—I am not talking of working classes; I am talking of middle class people. There are so many clerks in Calcutta who during a whole year, they run their establishment and their economy only one two shirts and 4 dhotis. It is something that you can't imagine. You can't cut it down beyond that. This is a marginal level of nakedness. How can you cut it down further? That is why I say it is a fallacy. We do not know the consumption levels in the various sectors of our society. We do not know what is the *per capita* consumption of the peasant, of the labourer, of the middle classes, of the lower division clerk and the upper division clerk. Let us know that. On the basis of those figures, I would be prepared to enter into a discussion. When a general overall statement is made that money is circulating in the country, everybody is going to buy more cloth and therefore, we must reduce the consumption, I am not prepared to accept such a plea because the facts of life disprove that.

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

Our party was the first to ask, if you have deficit financing, the prices will go up, and so, what is your price policy? Today, the Home Minister said, we know what happened when there was control. Certainly, we know what happened under control. Is that the type of control that we have been demanding? Is the Government not capable of seeing that there are no more blackmarketers? Can they not check them and see that the people are given the essentials of life at a level of prices in which the people can buy them? At least the essentials of life should be guaranteed. If we do not guarantee that, we have no right to plan development and do propaganda about the Five Year Plans. Sacrifice, everyone is prepared to make. For the people who are on the verge of starvation, whose level of living is the level of nakedness, you must increase the production, production which would put an extra shirt on their back and which will give an additional morsel of food. If that is not so, if you bring forward this Bill we are not going to accept it. Even if you can put it through by the votes that you can commandeer, the people will fight inch by inch because it is a question of life and death for them.

You talk of the Second Plan. Is this what is going to happen: as we go forward, more and more essentials of life are to be taxed? Are the resources for the Plan going to be found more and more from the ordinary man, from his food, from his cloth? If that is so, this is a serious foreboding. When we asked that the profits should be mopped up, there should be a ceiling on dividends, what is it that we have heard from that side? Incentives are needed for private capital. It was said, unless we give them such incentives, we shall be distributing poverty. When we talked of putting a ceiling on income, the Prime Minister of all people got up and opposed it. At that time, we were told that we are going to distribute poverty. When they bring forward a Bill to increase the excise duty on the poor man's cloth, medium

cloth, do they expect that we are going to support such a measure? Even if it should go down in the history to our shame that we have passed this measure, the other people will not support that.

I wish to bring forward a few facts. But, before that, I should like to make one point, at this stage. The figures that have been given to us are availability of cloth *per capita* in yards. I do not know how much is the consumption. We do not know the consumption figures for the various sectors of our society. When I tried to look into the figures I found that it was 15.75 yards in 1939. Further down, I found that in January to July 1956, the *per capita* figure is 16.8 yards. If that is the availability, and if we are told that in July 1956, we have achieved record production. I should like to know how it is, that, the stocks have declined? This is the question that I put to the Finance Minister.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

4-58 P.M.

Then, I want to place before the House certain facts. For instance, during the Budget, we put a duty on mustard oil. What did we see? The price went up from Rs. 1-8-0 to Rs. 1-12-0, Rs. 2-4-0, now it is Rs. 2-10-0, Rs. 2-12-0. What happened? Fair price shops were opened in my State after great agitation. But, never did they function. Now, the Government has come forward to say, we fail to keep these shops open because you will not allow us the mustard seeds to come and all that has gone into black market. If that is what is going to happen, if the Government are unable to check profiteers and black-marketers and if you are going to put up the prices, the people who are on the marginal level of starvation in food and clothing, will be squeezed out of their ability to buy them. That is why I will plead again that if you are really serious about these Plans, Plans which will not only enthrone the people, but which will give certain very essentials to the people, like food and

clothing, you have to change this fiscal policy. We would say this even in regard to the manner this particular fiscal policy has been worked out in its details. Coarse cloth has not been taxed. It sounds good. But already my hon. friend Shri Bansal has pointed out that a large portion of the demand of this coarse cloth is in the form of tapestry, sheets and very little is used in form of dhoties, sarees, etc. Take the case of medium cloth. At least, you have to exempt medium cloth if you cannot exempt anything else. That is what 70 per cent. of our people use. There is no question of some people here saying, please do not introduce this excise for the time of the Puja or Pongal or some other festival. Are we going to hoodwink the people in this way and then introduce this duty later on? It is a matter of principle that today, on the eve of the Second Plan, we should clearly tell the people that development plans do not mean that all the resources are only to be squeezed out of the poorest of the poor, but that those at the top will have to pay. They will have to sacrifice. We too shall sacrifice on luxury goods, but on essential goods not a pie more should be payable by the people. That is the cry of the people. Even if you pass this Bill, we shall fight it tooth and nail, right upto the last ditch. This is my last word.

5 P.M.

Shri Matthen (Tiruvellah): I agree with the previous speakers that the major part of this excise duty will be passed on to the consumer. This is really an evil and it calls for a lot of pity from us, and I have a lot of pity for all including myself because I have to pay much more for textiles, but even though it is an evil, it is a necessary evil. It is a necessary evil because as the hon. former Commerce and Industry Minister has told us—and I have great faith in his foresight and judgement—the supply of textiles is very much below the demand and the demand

is going ahead of supply, and it is quite possible, though not probable, that the price of cloth will go higher in the black market. As my friend Shrimati Renu Chakravarty just now pointed out, the price of mustard oil has gone up because it has all gone to the black market. If things go at this rate, all the available cloth will go into the black market and we will have to pay much more than we will have to pay by way of excise duty. The main object of this excise duty, as the hon. Minister has said, very clearly is not to raise money for Government, but to create consumer resistance, because the only way of stopping or restraining this tendency of great demand for cloth is for the people to show a certain amount of resistance when they find that the prices go up.

Our economy has been developing. It is no more a stagnant economy, and when it has been developing naturally people have got more money; though it is bad enough, I admit, still they would naturally like some more cloth, some better cloth. That developing economy was not properly taken note of by the former Commerce and Industry Minister. In fact, I want an explanation from the former Commerce and Industry Minister as to why he did not take notice of this developing economy and did not provide for it. I can excuse him if he has not provided for steel or cement, but I cannot excuse him, with the equipment we have got, for not providing for an expanding economy for textiles. We have got mills with plenty of scope and potential. Why did he not permit more looms? That is an explanation which I demand of the present Finance Minister. If we had adequate supplies, this Bill would never have come up and there would have been no necessity for it.

Even now this excise duty is only a temporary relief. It is not going to solve the problem. I am afraid with all the consumer resistance,

[Shri Matthen]

textiles will go into the black market. The basic solution is supply, a larger supply of textiles as our economy is expanding. You are thinking of handloom, Amber charkha, Khadi and all the rest of it. With due respect to all of them, it is impossible to resist the natural instinct of people for fine textiles, better textiles, cheaper textiles, by means of excise duties like this except for a short time. So, my submission is it would not solve it basically. The basic solution is more production. That I think is most essential, but without creating consumer resistance, which is expected will be done by this Bill, there is going to be very bad black market business. I do not know whether even Members of Parliament will get *dhotis sarees*, but it will be very difficult for others to get. It will be worse than controls. The only thing we can do today is to pass this Bill and create consumer resistance as much as possible. Otherwise, the consequence will be worse. The shortness of supply will make it a complete black market business, and the poor people for whom we are all pleading will have to pay more than otherwise by paying this excise duty.

The most important thing, as I said before, is to expand production because our economy is still developing. If we succeed in implementing the Second Five Year Plan, and I believe we will, the demand will be much more. So, I would earnestly request the Government to make provision for expansion of textile production.

पंडित ज० ना० भालवीय (रायसेन) : मैं ने इस बिल के ऊपर कुछ स्पीचिज (भाषण) सुनीं और इस के स्टेटमेंट आफ आबजेक्ट्स एंड रीजन्स (कारणों तथा उद्देश्यों का विवरण) को भी पढ़ा है। इस का विरोध करते हुये अभी एक आनरेबल मेम्बर ने कहा कि यद्यपि हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब बहुत अच्छी दलीलें दे सकते हैं,

लेकिन इस बिल के पक्ष में उन्होंने जो दलीलें दी हैं, वे कर्नासिंग (विश्वसनीय) नहीं हैं। इस बिल के विरोध में जो स्पीचेज हुई हैं, उन में नाम लिया गया है जनता का और कहा गया कि इस बिल के पास होने पर एक्साइज ड्यूटी (उत्पादन शुल्क) लगेगी और उसका असर आम जनता पर पड़ेगा। अगर इसको ऊपरी नज़र से देखा जाये, तो शायद लोग कुछ भुलावे में आ जायें, लेकिन अगर जरा गहरी दृष्टि से इस पर गौर किया जाये, तो एक अजीब सा दृष्टिकोण सामने आता है। अगर यह तजवीज दी जाती कि बढ़ती हुई प्राइसिज (मूल्यों) को कंट्रोल (नियंत्रण) करने के लिये कोई ऐसा कदम उठाया जाये, जिससे प्राइसिज भी कम हो जायें और जो प्रक्रियरिंग (मुनाफ़ाबाजी) इस समय हो रहा है, वह भी न हो, तो वह तजवीज तो समझ में आ सकती थी। और वह कदम यही हो सकता था कि एसन्शियल कमोडिटीज (आवश्यक वस्तुएं) पर पूरे तरीके से कंट्रोल किया जाये—उनका राशनिंग किया जाये। लेकिन यह कहने की भी हिम्मत नहीं होती। मैं उन लोगों में से हूँ, जो कि पूरे तरीके से कंट्रोल को मानते हैं और यह समझते हैं कि जब तक हमारी प्लैन्ड इकानोमी (आयोजित अर्थव्यवस्था) में कंट्रोल नहीं होगा, राशनिंग नहीं होगा, तब तक अपनी लिमिटेड (सीमित) प्राइव्शन (उत्पादन) को देखते हुये लोगों की बढ़ती हुई मांग को पूरा करने और जनता के जीवन को एक स्तर पर लाने में हम कामयाब नहीं हो सकते हैं। हम देखते हैं कि हमारे पूंजीपति भाईयों ने एक अजीब सा जाल बिछा रखा है, जिसमें हमारे कुछ प्रगतिशील भाई और बहिनें भी फस जाते हैं और उन के धोखे को न समझ कर उन का समर्थन कर जाते हैं, हालांकि उस में जनता का कोई फायदा नहीं होता है—सिर्फ पूंजीपतियों का फायदा होता है। यहां पर इस बात का जवाब नहीं दिया गया है।

कि अगर एक्साइज ड्यूटी (उत्पादन शुल्क) न लगाई जाती तो इस वक्त जो फायदा हो रहा है, वह किस तरह कंट्रोल किया जा सकता है और प्राइसिज को कैसे चेक किया जा सकता है। उस के लिये यह तजवीज की जा सकती है कि प्राइसिज को कंट्रोल किया जाये और साथ ही दूसरे टैक्स लगाये जायें। जैसा कि होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है, आपोजीशन मेम्बरज (विपक्ष के सदस्य) और वे साहेबान, जिन्होंने इसका विरोध किया है, इस का जवाब नहीं दे सकते हैं। इस वक्त जो कन्डीशन (स्थिति) है—जो प्राडक्शन है और जो डिमांड (मांग) है और उनका जो रिश्ता है, उस के लिहाज से प्राइसिज बराबर बढ़ रही है और फायदा कमाया जा रहा है। इस बिल का विरोध करने का मतलब सिवाय इसके कुछ नहीं है कि हम मैनुफैक्चरर (निर्माता) और प्राफिटीयरर द्वारा कमाये जाने वाले नफे को कम नहीं करना चाहते हैं और उनको सपोर्ट (समर्थन) करना चाहते हैं। इस लिये अगर हमें प्राइस को कंट्रोल करना है तो हमको ऐसा करने के लिये अपने सामने एक तजवीज रखनी होगी और उस तजवीज को कामयाब बनाने के लिये आपको गवर्नमेंट को पूरी ताकत देनी चाहिये ताकि गवर्नमेंट पूरी तरह से कंट्रोल कर सके। और फिर भी अगर बलूक मार्केटिंग (चोर बाजारी) और प्राफिटियरिंग (मुनाफा खोरी) हो तो आप बड़ल्ले से गवर्नमेंट से कह सकते हैं कि ऐसा क्यों हो रहा है। अगर दूसरे मुल्क प्राइस को कंट्रोल कर सकते हैं तो मैं नहीं समझता कि वैसे हिन्दुस्तान में क्यों नहीं किया जा सकता। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि कंट्रोल भी नहीं किया जाये और प्राइसेज फिर भी न बढ़ें तो और कौनसा तरीका हो सकता है सिवा इसके कि एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगायी जाये। इस लिये मेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि इस बिल का अपोजीशन (विरोध) क्यों किया जा रहा है। हमको इस बिल का पूरा तरीके से समर्थन करना चाहिये।

मैं पूरी ताकत से इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ इस लिये कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो प्राफिटियरिंग हो रहा है वह बन्द हो। जो फिगर्स दिये गये हैं उनसे जाहिर होता है कि होलसेल प्राइस (थोक मूल्य) में और जिस प्राइस पर जनता खरीदती है उसके कितना बड़ा अन्तर है, और यह मार्जिन आफ प्राफिट (लाभ की मात्रा) कुछ जनता की जेब में नहीं जा रहा है। क्या जनता इस बड़ी हुई कीमत से कोई फायदा उठा रही है? इससे जनता को नुकसान हो रहा है और हमारा फर्ज है कि हम इस मामले में जनता की मदद करें। यह बिल जनता को राहत देने के लिये लाया गया है, फिर क्या बजह है कि जनता का नाम ले कर इसका विरोध किया जाता है। हमें हर तरह से इस मामले में गवर्नमेंट को सपोर्ट करना चाहिये और इस बिल का समर्थन करना चाहिये ताकि यह जो सपना पूंजीपतियों की जेब में जा रहा है इसको रोका जा सके। माननीय सदस्य गौर करें कि इस का विरोध करके वे जनता के हितों की रक्षा नहीं कर रहे हैं बल्कि मैनुफैक्चरर (निर्माता) को, होलसेल डीलर (थोक व्यापारी) को और पूंजीपति को फायदा पहुंचा रहे हैं। इन चीजों को ध्यान में रखकर मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल का पूरी तरह से समर्थन किया जाना चाहिये। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस एक्साइज ड्यूटी के लगने से जनता को किसी भी तरह का नुकसान पहुंचेगा। अगर नुकसान पहुंचेगा तो उन लोगों को जो नफा कमा रहे हैं।

साथ ही साथ डिमांड (मांग) और सप्लाई (संभरण) की भी एक दलील है। आप और हम ऐलीमेंटरी इकानोमिक्स (सैद्धान्तिक अर्थशास्त्र) से वाकिफ हैं। अगर एक चीज का प्रोडक्शन कम है और मांग ज्यादा है तो वह महंगी होगी और उस हालत में खरीदने वाला एक हद तक ही उसे खरीद सकता है, और उसके आगे या तो उसे अपनी डिमांड कम करनी होगी या प्रोड्यूसर की कीमत घटानी होगी। कोई प्रोड्यूसर अपने

[पंडित च० ना० मालवीय]

यहां स्टॉक रखकर उसे सड़ायेगा नहीं और प्राइसेज नीचे आवेंगे। इस बिल में यह कहा गया है कि इस बिल को लाने में सरकार का इरादा पैसा कमाना नहीं है। आप नहीं चाहते कि सरकार कंट्रोल लागू करे और फिर भी आप चाहते हैं कि कीमतें बढ़ें नहीं, तो फिर और कौनसा तरीका हो सकता है सिवा इसके कि एक्साइज इयूटी लगायी जाये। इसी तरीके से इस बढ़ती हुई कीमत को रोका जा सकता है।

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It does make one sad that almost as my first effort, I should bring forward a measure which should have evoked a certain amount of sentimental opposition, and put me in the wrong along with many of my colleagues in the House. The point really is, as the last speaker emphasised, that the point of view presented to the House by Government has not been fully appreciated, nor have any alternatives been suggested in order to meet the situation.

I would not like to repeat what my hon. colleague the Home Minister has said. I think it is worthwhile reading out again to the House what my hon. friend Shri S. V. Ramaswamy referred to, namely, para 4 of the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It says:

"It is not intended, however, immediately to enforce these rates to the full extent....."

—that is to say, these rates of 4 annas and 6 annas.

"....Some increases are being made now and it is the intention that a constant watch be kept on the movement of prices and to the extent that excessive profits are made in relation to the fair ex-mill price as worked out on the basis of the formula of the Tariff Commission, and increasing percentage of such profits may be

taken away as excise duty. Correspondingly, if prices indicate a downward trend, necessary adjustments will be made in the excise duty."

That meets the point made by my hon. friend Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava. If the trend is downward, we will make the change that is necessary downwards. So, the whole concept of the Bill is that this is something which should go up and go down according to the movement of the prices, and not essentially intended as a taxation measure. I think that, that at any rate, ought to convince such of those as are willing to be convinced of the *bona fides* of Government in this particular matter, namely that if we want a taxation measure, naturally, we have to tell the House that it is going to be a taxation measure, but we intend this to be a measure which would, to some extent, deal with the situation which has been created by a rise in demand, and the production not meeting the increased demand.

Most of the hon. Members who have spoken have stressed this point, namely that the common man will be affected, that prices will rise, that this will add to the rising price, and that this is going to add to the cost of living and so on.

But I would like to deal first with the speech of my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta. In fact, the confusion that, he said, existed in either in his mind or mine still exists in regard to another matter. I think his speech was in support of Government generally, while, at the same time, he could not give his support to this specific measure.

My hon. friend had laid down certain propositions, which, from the point of view of pure economics, certainly, are unexceptionable. But before going into the points that he raised, I would like to deal with the question which has now become almost—it is not a hardy annual, but

it seems to be—a hardy month these days, namely this question of leakage. I can assure the hon. Member that we considered this matter only a few hours before actually the Bill was made public. And even the intelligent anticipation has not envisaged the possibility of our imposing an excise duty with a ceiling, and that it would be on the basis of an adjustable equilibrium, moving up and down with the prices. To that extent, I think we have cheated those people who have been trying to surmise what move Government will take next.

If my hon. friend would perhaps throw back his mind to what has been appearing in the papers over the last six months, he will find that this is one of the suggestions which have been made periodically in the press, namely, that there will be an increase in the excise duty, because they feel that whenever Government want money, one of the commodities they will tax would be cloth. So, it is only a matter of intelligent anticipation.

I can also tell the hon. Member that so far as the stocks with the wholesalers and retailers generally are concerned—I cannot say I have had a very correct and precise evaluation—we could not have chosen a better moment for imposing an excise duty, because the stocks were almost at their lowest, and they had run down to a considerable extent. They were being replenished, and they would be replenished this month. That is one of the reasons why we chose this time being the time when the stocks will be low.

To come to the main points of my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta's speech, I would like to say that on this question of excise duty and mopping up of the surplus profit or restraining consumption, the answer is—as he is an economist, he knows that economic science never gives us very precise answers. It only indicates trends—that it is expected to do both.

That it mops up profit to the extent it could. To the extent that the prices rise as a result of it and, therefore, contributes to attract the law of diminishing returns, it must restrain consumption. But it is quite conceivable that the demand would be such that this might be a flea-bite and the prices might increase further. There is no point in anybody asking me to give an assurance that such and such things will not happen, because I am not having a laboratory test. I am experimenting in a world of 377 million, in a very large country, and also with frontiers which are practically non-existent. It might be quite possible that some of the shortages that occur in the frontier area is due to cloth or something else moving across the frontier. So there is an element of impreciseness in all estimates, because we do not know the exact depth to which we will reach, the exact nature of the demand not only within our country but also in the adjoining areas.

So all I would like to aver now is in regard to what are expected to be the trends in the future.

A point was made—I do not think my hon. friend made it; he is far too much an economist to make that—that any increase in excise duty is increased inflation. I thought that all taxation was disinflationary. Of course, if hon. Members say that it is regressive, because it taxes a commodity, the consumption of which is inelastic, there may be something about it. I am not here pleading that the tax is not regressive, though I do not quite concede the point that in a country with a very high marginal rate of consumption propensity, cloth consumption is inelastic. Cloth consumption is, to some extent, elastic. I know of the time when cloth prices were high when I had myself put off purchasing cloth. You put it off for a period of five or six months; do not purchase it. If there is a tear in your shirt or something like that, you try to stitch it. I have done it myself.

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

So the inelasticity of consumption does not come with cloth in a country of this kind. There all again may be economic truisms, but nonetheless, every one of these ideas has some application in the context of the events that we are now facing. Therefore, the remedy that we have suggested now is undoubtedly an extremely short-term remedy. My hon. friend, Shri Matthen, is quite correct when he taxed me with dereliction of duty, that is, I have not provided enough flexibility in my installed capacity in regard to the textile industry to meet a situation of this nature.

I do not think my hon. friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, was quite correct because he is one of those persons who found fault with me for the first time.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: I know.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: He used to be a very good friend of mine—and he is still a friend of mine—but he found fault with me because I said that cloth consumption would be much higher.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Found fault with because you are for the first time as Finance Minister.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The point really is that he will mellow in time, as I have mellowed.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: It is not your fault.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The point is that it is true I do foresee that cloth consumption will rise rapidly. I have no doubt in my mind about that. I will come to the point raised by Shri Asoka Mehta in that regard later. To some extent, my friend, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, did not give me the impression that he is a student of economics. He said: 'all right. Increase the installed capacity. But seal it. Do not allow it to function, so that we will use it some time or other. Give licences for spindles not to new mills which will want to

function, but to the existing mills, so that you keep your reserve capacity, and use it when you want more production. This would have been the right thing.' Here we are in this plight and I have to defend myself. But we are both culpable of not persevering in regard to a matter where we knew the consequences.

I will safely advise my colleague who is now in charge of the textile industry, that we should have in our hands certain reserve capacity which could be used for occasions. I still hold with my hon. friend, Shri S. V. Ramaswamy, that the incidental advantage that our negligence has given to the handloom industry must be preserved and sustained. But that should only be an incidental advantage and we should always be prepared for an emergency of this nature. We have been caught badly. I will try to do my very best in conjunction with my colleague, the Minister of Commerce and Consumer Industries. But it will take time. I am suggesting, therefore, that it is admittedly a short-term remedy. But I do hope that it will only be a short-term remedy. Nobody will have greater pleasure than myself if, say, when I review this matter every month—as I propose to review prices every month—I find that the prices have gone down and I can reduce the duty by a quarter or half anna; though it will certainly mean that the budgetary gap will become bigger, I shall certainly keep my promise.

I might come to you for some other thing, but I shall not use this for ad hoc revenue purposes. If prices do not go up, and I still want money, I will come and tell you that I want straightway taxation on an article of consumption, not for the purpose of mopping up profits or curtailing consumption.

To come back again to Shri Asoka Mehta, he made a number of general propositions in regard to our policy.

But I hope that there may be an opportunity for me to deal with some aspects of the points that he raised when we discussed the Plan. At the same time, if I now say to him what I propose to do this year—levy an X tax or a Y tax or a Z tax and so on—I think the budget will have leaked out now. But I do agree that all taxes must be compensatory and the supreme purpose that we have before us, namely, the Plan, must somehow be fulfilled.

I can give one assurance. Somebody says: 'You are a friend of the capitalist'. Somebody says: 'You are a friend of the handloom weaver'. So far as the Finance Minister is concerned, he has to be a friend of nobody. Of course, as a matter of fact, as years progress, he will have no friend, neither in the capitalist sector nor in any other sector. That is inevitable. But it is not a question of our viewing it from this or that purpose. It really is a question of the Plan and if I can possibly get some money from any source which is left, it does not matter where we get it from.

Therefore, I do not propose now to deal with this subject further, because this is hardly the occasion when I can elaborate on taxation and economic policy—and it will be improper because I have not even applied my mind to this, though one might have vague ideas. Nor do I propose to respond to the request made by my very good friend, Shri Bansal, to develop an economic philosophy. May be my hon. friend, Shri H. N. Mukerjee thinks that this socialism of ours, of what we say, is just an eye-wash. May be that he is right that we should better have democratic centralism, and there will be nothing like it at all. If I feel that prices should be raised for the purpose of inhibiting consumption, I will raise prices, because Government will have control. It may be a monolithic structure. Government will have got all the power. We will raise prices if we

want; we will lower prices if we want. Yes, democratic centralism has a great appeal to the people who have the Bismarckian tradition in their mind. But I do not very much know about Bismarck. For one thing, I have not got the erudition of my hon. friend. But it is a very poor pun, an intellectual pun, to just take the casual remark of a newspaper and call me 'Iron Chancellor'. I am afraid I am not even a wooden chancellor. I am a chancellor composed of cells which are decaying; I hope those cells will sustain me as long as I am asked to function as Finance Minister. But it is a very poor pun. We are not Bismarcks here. May be my hon. friend does not believe in our *bona fides*. I have no hope of converting him. If I could, I shall be pleased but I realise it is impossible.

Therefore, we shall still be friends while I know that I cannot convert him because he won't be converted. The door for reason is barred so far as mind is concerned. It is only the dogma inside his mind that has closed the door for reason.

Shri S. S. More: Do not be so pessimistic.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I cannot be quite so optimistic as my friend Shri More. I am optimistic because I think my friend is coming over to our side. He speaks of election and the reason why we should not raise taxes at the time of election. I shall wait for that combination but I am not.....

Shri S. S. More: On a point of personal explanation.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri S. S. More: On a point of order Sir.

Mr. Speaker: No point of order. The hon. Member will hear me first. Is it the hon. Member's point that he alone has the right to interrupt and the Minister has no right to reply? It is really the hon. Member who

[Mr. Speaker]

started this and the Minister says something and he wants to say something by way of personal explanation. Are we to go on like this till 6.00 or 6.30? I cannot allow these long interruptions and their replies. Why did the hon. Member start this game? When he has started it why should he be impatient of a retort?

Shri S. S. More: Is it only by way of retort or is it by way of some personal fact.....

Mr. Speaker: Let him say all these things and explain it outside.

Shri S. S. More: Kindly permit me on this occasion to offer some explanation. It is not so easy a matter as.....

Mr. Speaker: Why should he interrupt the Minister and create all this?

Shri S. S. More: I interrupted him on economic policy; but he is retorting me on a personal matter.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order? Let me know it.

Shri S. S. More: My submission is that the political future of any one individual cannot be a matter which can be discussed. Is he giving out that I am going over to his side as a sort of inference from his views or is he giving it out as a statement of fact? That is my submission.

Mr. Speaker: I am not concerned with that. The hon. Minister is entitled to say from the speech of any hon. Member that he infers that that hon. Member is going over to his side.

Shri S. S. More: Some Ministers are coming over to this side; some Members may go that side. (Interruptions).

Shri A. M. Thomas (Ernakulam): Protesting too much.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think my hon. friend Shri More has been

successful—in making me lose my thread.

We now come back to the speech of my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta. As I have said just now, I would prefer to deal with this question of the general policy in regard to whether we should restrict consumption.

One of my statements has been taken out of its context and read by my friend Shri Bansal as indicating that I have said that we should allow consumption goods to be developed and made available for people. In fact, I have said so very often because I feel very strongly that we cannot ask people of the lower income groups in this country who do not have even the necessities to tighten their belts. I have always said this and I suppose this will be a common ground between me and my friend Shrimati Renu Chakravartty that austerity is a luxury which only rich can indulge in. But, at the same time, there are certain factors of consumption which we will have to check and postpone consumption to a time when we will be able to afford it.

Of course, the point that he raised about channelling excess consumption into investments is something which is vital for the Plan though it would be rather difficult to say that I restrict a particular type of consumption and immediately invest in present reserves. But, I am not going to deal with that aspect of it now. I particularly agree with him that there are many many commodities where we have to restrict consumption. I would also agree with most of my hon. friends that if we can possibly have a restriction imposed on the consumption of cloth I will do it.

Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava: Do you propose to tax the labourer who is getting Rs. 104 yearly on average according to your estimates? Do you want to tax him for cloth?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not taxing. The whole trouble about it is this. My approach to this problem is not taxation. Taxation is not the main purpose of this measure. If it is the main purpose, I will plead guilty. I would like to avoid taxation on cloth but I cannot avoid it.

What alternatives have hon. Members suggested to me? Excess profits tax. But when the demand and supply do not equal, excess profits tax cannot take away the profit at a particular source. Perhaps it may or may not raise a profit. Here is a question of shortage and the shortage will inevitably raise the price. I say, yes. If prices are being raised some portion of it is being taken away.

An. Hon. Member: Increase production.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I agree with hon. Members. I would like to do everything possible to increase production. The only trouble is that we have in the past, for some other reason, thought that we should seal the creation of capacity. We have sealed production—we have sealed the creation of capacity. We felt that it is not right that capacity must be in our hands whether it is utilised or not. May be now the hon. Members are giving a place of primacy to production. I will take that as a mandate and we will see that capacity is increased so that that capacity can be made to produce more goods. Therefore, while, on the academic plans, I would say I would like to agree with my friend Shri Asoka Mehta because whatever he has said is correct and that leads to a very large extent the diffusion of means we have. But in the case of this particular commodity, it is not a question of restriction of consumption. At the present moment we have nothing else to do. There is no getting away from facts. Increase consumption; yes, we will try; it will take 12 months.

My hon. friend, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha is one of those persons

who have been specialising in the textile industry, and she has always been against our policy. She has a right to condemn me but I do not think my hon. friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has got the right. I will accept condemnation at her hands because she has told me that what I do is wrong and that it will lead to trouble.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena (Lucknow Distt. cum Bara Banki Distt.): I should like to put a question to the hon. Minister.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes.

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: I want to be assured that the stocks would pass to the consumers and that they would not be kept with the middlemen as it happened in the case of the sugar mills. It may be a plan for the mill-owners to get sanction for having fresh licences. Can the hon. Minister assure me that the whole stock would pass to the consumers and not to the middlemen who are only the relations and agents of the mill-owners?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The point that my hon. friend makes is slightly different. It means some control of distribution. I am coming to that particular point a little later. If actually we do increase the installed capacity.....

Shri Mohanlal Saksena: I only want this assurance. Can you say that all the stocks would pass to the consumers and not to the middlemen as it has been the case in the sugar industry? All these profits go to the middlemen.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member himself was also a Minister. If he goes on interrupting like this what can the Minister do? He has put a question; let him wait for the answer.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It does not matter; I like the interruption of my hon. friend. But the point really is that we are not in a position to

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

add to supplies. We have to regulate the movement of goods from the mill end to the wholesaler and the retailer and ultimately to the consumer. I am coming to that point presently.

As I said, we propose to learn from this lesson. We shall make an attempt to increase the capacity so that we can use that capacity. But Shri Ramaswamy need not be afraid that it means that that capacity is going to be used to the detriment of the handloom—as the powerloom will not be used to the detriment of the handloom.

I come next to the question of what we could do to relieve the position of the public. We have more or less now committed ourselves to the position that we cannot have controls and rationing. The only other alternative is rationing of commodity. My hon. friend, Shri Tripathi said that sarees, dhotis and long-cloth should be made available. Unless it be that I can increase the production of sarees, dhotis and long-cloth, I cannot do what he wants. If I have an increased production, I can say, this must be sold at a particular price; we have control only for that. That means the question does not cover up every other piece of textile article. We have not got the production. The alternative is to have controls and rationing. We should try to educate the public.

We come back to the position that I took up this morning that we must tell the people not to pay higher prices and buy, that is, to postpone consumption. I propose to ask friends here that we should try to educate the public and tell them what are the reasonable prices at particular areas and the public should get to know about it. By an act of voluntary denial, they will not buy to the extent that they would normally do, and it will help. Then the prices will come down, there will be slump in the market and automatically the prices will come down.

Shri S. S. More: May I know whether the Government are proposing to open their own shops where articles can be had at fair prices?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: There is no use starting any fair price shops at a time where there is scarcity. If I am going to start a fair price shop and, say, give 5 or 10 yards per head, the retail dealer will come and buy it and very soon the fair price shop will be exhausted. I have got the experience in regard to Handloom Emporium where we have been selling at a particular price and giving a rebate. A fair price shop is not the answer. The only weapon that we have now in our hands is to educate the public not to pay higher prices. Whether we will be able to do it or not is a thing which hon. Members can judge. But it might have a limited validity, and I am quite prepared to take those steps.

The other hon. Members will certainly like that I should reply to them. Shri Bansal, who is a very competent critic of Government, has this time not been quite so careful. He has taken the figures that I have given and thought of them in terms of percentages. They are not percentages at all. The figures given in paragraph 1 of the Statement of Objects and Reasons are not percentages but they relate to the cost per lb. of cloth, the cost per lb. of cotton mix, that is the cotton that goes into the production of cloth. Therefore, the margins he has worked out and the percentages he has shown are not quite correct. But his point was that the mill-owner is not making the profit. The mill-owner may not be making the profit as much as I say he is; maybe there are increased costs of production. But there are one or two facts in his statement which are not correct, because I think the price of coal was raised on the 26th June, and I have given the price only up to June. The increased price of coal

will not come into the operative cost here. There are one or two other matters which would not certainly justify the increase in manufacturing cost to the same level. On the other hand, Shri Tripathi has been complaining that wages have not increased. I will leave this matter to Shri Morarka and Shri Bansal on the one side and Shri Tripathi on the other.

Shri Bansal: Will you please check up whether coal prices have not increased by 25 per cent. during last year?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Coal prices have been fixed at a particular level; we relate the increase on coal prices consequent on the recommendations of the Tribunal, and the new prices took effect on the 26th June. I would like to stand corrected, but I think that was the deadline, because a month after the recommendations were made, whether the Government issued an order or not, they ultimately will come into operation. The Government issued an order accepting the recommendations of the Tribunal but making certain variations according to particular areas. It may be that the cost of transport of coal might have gone into it. In any event, I see no justification for such an increase whatever may be the increase in the cost of production. I can understand an increase of four annas or eight annas but not an increase of that nature.

Shri Morarka is a knowledgeable critic though he does not attempt to be quite as competent as my friend, Shri Bansal. He was angry and he misunderstood the point regarding retail prices. The point is that between the actual retail price and the fair retail price is the lowest margin. The fair retail price is on the basis of the price fixation that we have by working in the past when we had controls—what is allowed for the retailer, what is allowed for the

wholesaler, what is allowed for transport, intermediate sales-tax and so on and how we make a fair retail price. Actually, the retail prices are much higher. That is the margin that represents the unfair profits that had been made by all sectors. I am not blaming the mill sector in this particular matter. If it is only the mill sector that is the offender, I will probably be able to catch it up.

Shri Asoka Mehta, I think, has sent a note to my hon. colleague, the Home Minister, as to why the Finance Minister should not tell the House that he prefers an excise duty to a levy on looms. Levy on looms is a very uncertain factor. You levy so much on looms. The looms may or may not work. It would be a better and more efficient weapon to collect excise duty on the production as against the looms.

To other points, Dr. Krishnaswami undoubtedly wanted a reply from me, but I am afraid much of what he said went above my head, either it is because he did not understand my point of view and my figures or I was not able to understand him. It is a case where ignorance is bliss, and I leave it at that.

I must greatly sympathise with the plea put forward by my hon. friends belonging to the other sex in regard to increase in the price of sarees. If anything can be done, we would certainly like to do it. But at the same time, hon. Members must realise that if the handloom industry is asking for a complete ban on mill production of sarees—I am sure quite a number of hon. Members are there on this side also who feel that that should be done—you cannot have it both ways.

I think this discussion, in which hon. Members have voiced an opposition to this Bill, has done one good thing—I am not speaking about hon.

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

Members opposite—it has opened our eyes to the realities of the situation. I have, as I stated on the last occasion when I spoke in this House, to say that we all suffer from a certain amount of ambevalence in this matter. In the first instance we would like to help Ambar Charkhas because it produces money for the rural worker and the part-time worker. I have no complaint against it. The consequence of it is that I must make the handloom weaver take the Ambar Charkha yarn and also make the Ambar Charkha pay slightly more than the mill yarn. Then we go to the handloom weaver. We want the handloom weaver to prosper. That means we put a check on mill production. But you want to make mill yarn available to the handloom weaver, for which he cannot give good prices. That means we must have more mill capacity and production (*Interruptions*). These stages have got to be reconciled somewhere.

I think this discussion has done a lot of good in probably making us mentally prepared for a reconciliation of the various factors. My proposition to them will be this: let us have the mill capacity, but let us control the capacity. We will realise the capacity or seal it as we want. Let us have the handloom yarn and the handloom production, but at the same time if we find that we have to give some additional support for the weaver to use the Ambar Charkha yarn, let us have a slight load on the mill yarn. Ultimately the load will go on to the consumer. You cannot have load distributed to the various sectors of the industry, and then say that the consumer will have to pay the price.

That is a good thing that has come out of this discussion on this Bill. With that note I would like to close. I would like to give an assurance to hon. Members that so far as the bona fides of the Government in this matter

are concerned, we feel that this is the only weapon left at the moment which we can use. The weapon will be used discreetly. It will not be used to the detriment of the common man. If the common is going to pay, let him pay to us and not the middlemen. At least some portion of it, let him pay to us. I cannot quite say what the percentages will be. An hon. Member read from the *Times of India*. I have got an extract here from the *Bharat Jyoti* which say that 50 per cent. will be absorbed by the mills. Our experience in April also indicated that half will be absorbed by mills, and the other half, of course, later on when the prices rise. But we must keep a watch, and if we find it going up we will come back and tell them that they cannot do it.

I would only submit to hon. Members who expressed grave doubts about the feasibility of this weapon, and also expressed doubts about the ultimate effect of it on the economy and on the Plan, that we shall watch it very carefully and if we find that their fears materialise, apart from the fact that certain consequences follow from a shortage of supply and increase in demand, the Government will certainly be resilient in this matter and will take all the necessary steps to ease the burden.

Shri B. S. Murthy: I want to know whether this excise duty will be levied on the cloth exported.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No; Sir; no tax is ever levied on exports.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, be taken into consideration."

The Lok Sabha divided: Ayes 200; Noes 27.