

Rules, 1956, laid on the Table on the 24th July, 1956, namely:—

- (i) in clause (a) of sub-rule (1), for “ten rupees” substitute “five rupees”; and
- (ii) in sub-rule (2), for “sub-section (1)” substitute “sub-rule (1)”.

This House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do concur in the said resolution.

4. This House resolves that in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 28 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950, the following amendment be made in rule 27 of the Representation of the People Preparation of Electoral Rolls) Rules, 1956, laid on the Table on the 24th July 1956, namely:—

in clause (b) of sub-rule (1), for “ten rupees” substitute “five rupees”.

This House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do concur in the said resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 2.5.

The House then adjourned for lunch at five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at five minutes past two of the clock, Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956—
continued

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे खेद है कि मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करने में सर्वथा असमर्थ हूँ क्योंकि हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर महोदय ने बड़ी एबिलिटी के साथ इस बिल के जो तीन, उद्देश्य बताये हैं, वे बड़ी समझदारी और सूझ-बूझ के साथ विचार करने पर भी मुझे बिल्कुल पूरे नहीं दिखाई देते, ऐसा मुझे प्रतीत होता है।

DR. R. B. GOUR (Hyderabad): I would request the hon. Member to speak in English because the Minister also does not know Hindi.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I can understand.

श्री उपसभापति : हिन्दी सीखना चाहिये सब सदस्यों को।

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : श्रीमन्, मैं बड़ी नम्रतापूर्वक कहना चाहती हूँ कि संसद् के तमाम सदस्य उनके इन सब तमाम आर्गुमेंट्स से सहमत नहीं हैं। जैसा कि उन्होंने कहा है कि वे मिल्स के प्राफिट को माप अप करना चाहते हैं, और चाहते हैं कि जो स्केयरसिटी है वह न रहे और कंजम्पशन लो हो जाय, कम हो जाय और उन्होंने यह भी बताया है कि इस एक्साइज बिल के द्वारा कंजम्पशन कम हो जायगा, ये सारी बातें मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि बिल्कुल निराधार और निरर्थक हैं।

श्रीमन्, उन्होंने यह बात कही है कि इसका असर मिल वालों पर पड़ने वाला है और मिल वालों के प्राफिट को माप अप करने के लिये यह मेजर है। यह भी बिल्कुल निराधार है, जैसा कि अन्य सदस्यों ने कहा है। कितने आश्चर्य का आर्गुमेंट दिया जाता है? अभी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा था, हम चाहते हैं कि चूँकि हालसेलर्स ज्यादा प्राफिट कमा लेते हैं इसलिये उनके थोड़े से प्राफिट को माप अप करने के लिये यह एक्साइज ड्यूटी बिल ला रहे हैं क्योंकि कपड़े के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं। चाहिये यह था कि जो गलत तरीके से दामों को बढ़ा कर जनता को नुकसान पहुँचाया जा रहा है उसे रोकते और जिस प्रकार से जनता को अन्यायपूर्वक ठगा जा रहा है उसको भी रोकते, परन्तु उसको तो रोका नहीं बल्कि उन्होंने यह कहा कि हम चाहते हैं कि इसमें से हम भी एक हिस्सा ले लें। यह बिल्कुल अनुचित है और किसी भी डेमोक्रेटिक सरकार को ऐसा आर्गुमेंट देना शोभा नहीं देता है।

श्रीमन्, कपड़े की बड़ी हुई कीमतों को रोकने के बारे में भी जो कहा गया वह भी बिल्कुल गलत और बेवूनियाद है। उन्होंने कहा कि इससे कपड़े की प्राइसेज रुकेंगी, कीमतें कम हो जायेंगी और उनका बढ़ना रुक जायगा। मेरा तो यह खयाल है कि कीमतों का बढ़ना रुकेगा नहीं बल्कि लोगों के अन्दर एक ऐसी साइकालाजी क्रिएट हो जायगी कि लोग समझने लगेंगे कि कपड़ा बहुत कम है, इसलिये लोग और ज्यादा कपड़ा खरीदना शुरू कर देंगे और इस तरह से मिल वालों को, कपड़े वालों को, रिटेलर्स को काफी मौका मिल जायगा कि वे कपड़े की प्राइसेज

को बढ़ा दें। अगर आप सचमुच ईसाफ बरतना चाहते हैं और यह चाहते हैं कि प्राइसेज कम की जायें तो आप यह क्यों नहीं करते हैं कि इस तरह के नियम बनायें कि जो लोग मिलों का कपड़ा लेंगे उनको उनके साथ हेंडलूम का कपड़ा भी लेना होगा। हेंडलूम का काफी स्टॉक जमा हो गया है। तो आप यह करें कि जो १० गज मिल का कपड़ा लें, वे ५ गज हेंडलूम का कपड़ा भी लें। इस तरह करने से न तो डिमांड ही बढ़ेगी और न स्कोयरसिटी ही बढ़ेगी और साथ ही साथ कपड़े के दाम भी काफी गिर जायेंगे।

इसके अतिरिक्त एक्सेज प्राफिट टैक्स को लगाने की बात है जैसा कि अन्य सदस्यों ने भी कहा है। वह भी एक बहुत उपयोगी मेथड था जिससे कि प्राइसेज घटाई जा सकती थीं। अगर सचमुच माननीय फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब मिल मालिकों के प्राफिट को थोड़ा सा कटौल करना चाहते तो उसका यह सबसे अच्छा तरीका था कि वह एक्सेज प्राफिट टैक्स लगाते इससे मिलों का प्रोडक्शन भी बढ़ाते और इससे यह भी होता कि उनका प्राफिट भी कटौल करते। और होना यह चाहिये कि हर शिफ्ट पर थोड़ी बहुत ड्यूटी वह लेवी करें। वह पहली शिफ्ट के ऊपर सबसे ज्यादा ड्यूटी रखते और दूसरी शिफ्ट पर उससे कम और तीसरी शिफ्ट पर सबसे कम रखते। इस तरह से वह मिल वालों को इंसेंटिव देते कि वे प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ायें। इससे प्रोडक्शन भी बढ़ता और उनको वह रुपया भी मिल जाता जो कि आज वह सब का सब गरीब जनता की जेब से निकालने जा रहे हैं। वह रकम इस प्रकार से वह आसानी से ले सकते थे।

श्रीमन्, यह बड़ा अन्याय हो रहा है कि मीडियम और कोर्स कपड़े पर भी यह टैक्स लगाया जा रहा है। आप जानते हैं कि देश में जो सबसे गरीब लोग हैं वे ही इस कपड़े का इस्तेमाल करते हैं और ७५ फीसदी कपड़ा मीडियम और कोर्स बनता है। अगर अच्छे सूत के कपड़े पर, बहुत बारीक कपड़े पर, सुपरफाइन कपड़े पर ६ आने की बजाय ८ आने भी टैक्स लगा देते तो कोई बात नहीं थी लेकिन कोर्स और मीडियम कपड़े पर लगाना ठीक नहीं है। कोर्स और मीडियम कपड़े पर टैक्स लगाना, उस गरीब जनता के ऊपर टैक्स लगाना, जिममें कि इतनी शक्ति नहीं है कि वह तन भर कपड़ा भी पहन सके, किसी भी तरह से उचित नहीं है। श्रीमन्, मिलों के लूम्स पर टैक्स लगाने की बात कही गई थी, ठीक है,

बशर्ते कि वह ट्रेडर्स को न देना पड़ता और मिल ओनर्स को ही देना पड़ता। यह भी बहुत अच्छा सजेशन था और उसको भी माना जा सकता है। उससे जो कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब का प्लान है, १७ या १८ करोड़ रुपया इकट्ठा करने का; वह भी पूरा हो जाता और साथ ही साथ जनता को भी कष्ट नहीं होता।

श्रीमन्, कल पंडित जी ने भी कहा और हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब भी बार बार कहते हैं कि प्रोडक्शन को अगर बढ़ाना है तो टेक्निक में इम्प्रूवमेंट लाना होगा और वह यह भी कहते हैं कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर को इलिमिनेट नहीं कर सकते हैं, उसका एक बहुत बड़ा स्थान है। इन सब बातों से ऐसा प्रतीत होता है जैसे कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर में कोई बड़ा पैनिंग फैला हुआ है, कोई बड़ा डर समायो हुआ है कि उसका इंटेरेस्ट मारा जाने वाला है और इसलिये यह आश्वासन पर आश्वासन दिये जाते हैं। मेरा तो ख्याल यह है कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर के व्यक्ति यह समझते हैं कि जब तक फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर महोदय मौजूद हैं तब तक उन्हें बिल्कुल शंका नहीं है और उनके हितों की रक्षा वे बराबर करते रहेंगे।

इस प्रकार के आश्वासनों का जो असर होता है, उससे प्राइवेट सेक्टर और पब्लिक सेक्टर के बीच में एक प्रकार से गलतफहमी पैदा होने की आशंका रहती है। बड़े से बड़े काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज के समर्थक और बड़े से बड़े डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन के समर्थक भी यह जानते हैं और इसका खुद भी समर्थन करते हैं कि देश में प्राइवेट सेक्टर का भी बहुत बड़ा स्थान है और बहुत बड़ा स्कोप है और टेक्निक का भी इम्प्रूवमेंट होना चाहिये परन्तु उसके साथ ही साथ हमारा कहना तो केवल इतना है कि यदि आप जितने प्रोडक्टिव सोर्सज हैं, उनका डिसेंट्रलाइजेशन नहीं करेंगे, तो लोगों की परचेजिंग पावर नहीं बढ़ेगी। अगर आप एक हजार मिलें खोल देंगे तो चन्द लोगों की जेबों में पैसा इकट्ठा हो जायगा पैसे की हॉर्डिंग हो जायगी और वह मनी सर-कुलेशन में नहीं आयेंगी। प्रोडक्शन तो बहुत बढ़ जायगा लेकिन परचेजिंग पावर नहीं बढ़ेगी। उससे ऐसा स्लम्प आ जायगा कि सब चीजें बुरी तरह से मंदी हो जायेंगी और बेचारा किसान मर जायगा और जिस इक्वीलिब्रियम की बात बार बार फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने कही है वह भी कहीं नहीं रहेगी। हम काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज के समर्थकों, ग्रामोद्योग के समर्थकों का यह भय है। वह कहेंगे कि हमें तो लोगों की क्रय सामर्थ्य को बढ़ाना है और हम ऐंट एनी कास्ट, ऐंट एनी

[श्रीमती सावित्री निगम]

रेट, इसको बढ़ाना चाहते हैं लेकिन उसके लिये हम क्या करें। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर अगर चाहें तो वे इतने एबिल हैं कि इसके लिये कोई तरीका निकाल सकते हैं। मैं भी संक्षेप में दो एक तरीकों पर प्रकाश डालूंगी जिनसे कि डिसेंट्रलाइज्ड तरीके पर प्रोडक्शन भी बढ़े और इक्वीलिब्रियम भी न घटने पाये। पहली बात यह होनी चाहिये कि जितने भी डिसेंट्रलाइज्ड सोर्सेज हैं, मसलन् हेंडलूम या पावरलूम वगैरह उनके लिये तुरंत एक सर्वे आर्गनाइज किया जाय। जितने हेंडलूम जो कि मौजूदा हालत में हैं उनकी क्या स्थिति है इसका ठीक ठीक पता आज तक नहीं लग पाया है। यह देश का कितना दुर्भाग्य है कि हेंडलूम के बारे में तरह तरह की फीगस है और अभी तक यह ठीक ठीक मालूम नहीं हो पाया है कि हेंडलूम की एग्जैक्ट फीगर्स क्या है। तो इसका तुरन्त सर्वे किया जाना चाहिये कि हेंडलूम को क्या क्या दिक्कतें हैं। जो जो दिक्कतें फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर महोदय के मन में है कि उनके पास वॉकिंग कैपिटल नहीं रहती, उनको काम नहीं मिलता, उनको सूत नहीं मिलता उनके लिये उनको चाहिये कि अपनी सारी शक्ति लगा करके, इन सब दिक्कतों को दूर करके, हेंडलूम को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा करें। इसके बजाय होता यह है कि हेंडलूम के जो जानकार हैं, हेंडलूम बोर्ड के जो मेम्बर्स हैं, वे बार बार कहते आये कि पावरलूम नहीं आने चाहिये लेकिन उनका विरोध करके, उन्हें ओवररूल करके, उन्हें बिल्कुल इग्नोरमेंट समझ करके, एक बिल्कुल डिक्टेटरशिप की तरह से पावरलूम को लाया जा रहा है। चाहे बोर्ड के मेम्बरान कुछ भी कहते रहें, या पार्लियामेंट के जितने सदस्य हैं वे कुछ भी कहते रहे, उनका बिना कोई खयाल किये यह लाया जा रहा है। श्रीमन्, यह एक बड़ी गलत चीज है, यह एक स्टेप मदर का सा व्यवहार है जो कि डिसेंट्रलाइज्ड प्रोडक्टिव सोर्सेज के साथ किया जा रहा है। हम में से कोई नहीं चाहता कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर को एलिमिनेट करें या उसको इनकरेज न करें लेकिन जहां तक डिसेंट्रलाइज्ड प्रोडक्टिव सोर्सेज का सम्बन्ध है उसके लिये हम चाहते हैं कि उसके साथ स्टेप मदर का सा व्यवहार न हो। हम चाहते हैं कि उसके प्रति एक भ्रातृत्व की भावना फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब अपने हृदय में पैदा करें और तब वह देखेंगे कि सारा देश उनके साथ हो जायगा।

श्रीमन्, मैं बड़ी नम्रता से एक बात और कहना चाहती हूं कि अगर वह जितने भी डिसेंट्रलाइज्ड प्रोडक्टिव सोर्सेज हैं, उनको फुलेस्ट कैपेसिटी में टैप आउट कर लें, उनको पूरा काम दे दें कि वे अपना प्रोडक्शन पूरी कैपेसिटी तक करें, तो फिर बहुत कुछ समस्या हल हो जाय। यह नहीं कि कहीं ११० दिन, कहीं ७६ दिन और कहीं वर्ष में ५५ दिन ये काम कर रहे हैं। आज हेंडलूम की स्थिति यह है कि स्टॉक भरा हुआ है, जितने कोआपरेटिव स्टोर्स हैं वे सब इससे भरे हुए हैं और उनके पास उसको निकालने का कोई रास्ता नहीं है। अगर वह यह करें कि मिल के कपड़े के साथ ही हेंडलूम का कपड़ा भी लेना होगा, जो २० गज मिल का कपड़ा लेगा उसको उसके साथ ५ गज या १० गज हेंडलूम का कपड़ा भी लेना पड़ेगा, तो उसका नतीजा यह होगा कि हेंडलूम का कपड़ा भी बिक जायगा, उसका स्टॉक भी खत्म हो जायगा और हेंडलूम अपने पैरों पर भी खड़ा हो जायगा। इसके बाद फिर वह चाहें तो हजार मिल खोलें, हम सब उसका समर्थन करेंगे। दो हजार स्पिन्डल्स क्या दो करोड़ स्पिन्डल्स का आर्डर देना हम मंजूर करेंगे, लेकिन श्रीमन्, ऐसी हालत में जब कि इस तरह का दोहरा व्यवहार हो रहा है हम बिना कहे उनसे कैसे रह सकते हैं। हेंडलूम पर सरकार ध्यान नहीं दे रही है जैसा कि उसे देना चाहिये और इसलिये हेंडलूम की हालत बहुत बुरी है। आप तुरंत सर्वे आर्गनाइज करें, उनके लिये तुरंत सर्वे कराने में कोई मुश्किल नहीं होगी। लेकिन मुझे खेद है कि जानबूझ कर इसको बराबर टाला जा रहा है। हेंडलूम की तरफ से जो ग्रांट सरकार से मांगी जाती है वह उसे नहीं दी जाती है, वॉकिंग कैपिटल के लिये ग्रांट्स नहीं दी जाती। सूत डाइरेक्ट दिलाने का इंतजाम नहीं है, कोआपरेटिव्स आर्गनाइज करने के लिये आफिसर्स नहीं हैं जो गांवों की इग्नोरेंट जनता तक पहुंच कर उनके लाभों से उनको परिचित करायें।

श्रीमन्, कपड़े की स्केयरसिटी भी एक अजीब मामला है। मैं अब तक यह नहीं मालूम कर पाई हूं कि कैसे आपने यह तय किया और किस सोर्स से आपको यह पता लगा कि कपड़े की रिक्वायरमेंट जो है वह बढ़ गई है।

(समय की घंटी)

श्रीमन्, दो मिनट और लूंगी। यह एक इंपोर्टेंट प्वाइंट है और इस पर मैं कुछ कहना चाहती हूं। तो कपड़े की स्केयरसिटी हो जाने

से उसकी जो रिक्वायरमेंट बढ़ गई है उसके बारे में जब जब मैंने प्रश्न किया मुझे यह मालूम हुआ कि मिलों में जो टेक आफ होता है उससे जाना जाता है कि स्केयरसिटी बढ़ रही है और गोदाम में कपड़ा नहीं है। लेकिन यह पता नहीं कि उसे जानने के सोर्सज क्या होते हैं। मैं दावे के साथ कह सकती हूँ कि जितनी बार मैंने इसी सर्वे के सम्बन्ध में सवाल किये, कभी भी मुझे संतोषजनक उत्तर नहीं मिला। यह सब जो हिसाब लगाया जा रहा है वह अनुमान के आधार पर लगाया जा रहा है। मैं पूछती हूँ कि इतने बड़े बड़े आफिसेज, ह्यूज आफिसेज और ये जो तमाम बड़े-बड़े डिपार्टमेंट बने हुए हैं और उनमें जो झुंड के झुंड आफिसर्स बैठे हैं, आखिर वे किसलिये बने हुए हैं, क्यों नहीं उनसे सर्वे कराया जाता है और रिक्वायरमेंट मालूम की जाती है? जहां स्केयरसिटी नहीं है वहां प्राइसेज क्यों शूट अप होते हैं। मैं नहीं कहती कि स्केयरसिटी नहीं है, लेकिन लोगों की यह शिकायत है कि जब कहीं प्राइसेस शूट अप करने होते हैं तो कपड़े वाले स्केयरसिटी पैदा कर देते हैं। इस तरह से भी स्केयरसिटी क्रियेट की जाती है कि माल को एक गोदाम से दूसरे गोदाम में शिफ्ट किया जाता है और कह दिया कि रिक्वायरमेंट कम हो गई.....

श्री उपसभापति : आपका समय हो गया।
श्री चन्द्रलाल पारिख ।

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: This Bill is very important, because the textile industry in our country is the second largest industry in the world, and I think that in a period of ten years it will be the first largest industry in the world. America is the first, and we are the second best, but I think that in course of ten years, we will be the first. I may just tell this House that the hon. Finance Minister told me that I have some actual experience of this industry, but whatever it is, there are some misgivings in my mind about it and I think that the figures which are given in the Statement of Objects and Reasons as well as in the notes circulated are wrong, and I am unable to agree with those figures with regard to the medium varieties. The precis in January were 46·17 annas; in August they were 66·95 annas a rise of 20 annas or 20·8 annas, or a rise of 43 per cent. I think that in January according to the Tariff Board prices, the mills were getting about 18

to 20 per cent. profit on the cost price. I refuse to believe this figure of a further rise of 43 per cent. and I have some knowledge of the varieties that are sold in the market. It may be in a specific variety, but if we take the average variety and the average units, I think that the figures are wrong.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Have you got any alternative figures?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I can produce the figures of 200 out of 289 mills. We know the daily rates, but these figures are not correct. I have not the time to present the correct figures at present. With regard to the rise in the prices of medium cloth, the Ministry should have taken some action earlier. As for the incidence of taxation, the incidence of taxation which Mr. Mahanty quoted from the papers is entirely wrong. This is a difficult and complex subject, and even reporters are not able to understand it in the way they do easily in the case of many other subjects. I say that in the first three months, from September to November, the incidence of 50 per cent. extra duty will be borne by the consumer. All this extra duty only to the extent of 50 per cent. will be borne by the mills and the reason is that four months' stocks are lying with the wholesalers and they have not paid this extra duty. Owing to this factor, this duty will not be borne 50 per cent. by the consumers. Then, from December to February end, the incidence of this taxation will be borne to the extent of 66 per cent. by the consumer, and from March onwards, it will be borne to the extent of 85 per cent. by the consumers. This is my calculation. All this extra duty will be borne by the consumer if no other measures are adopted. I will qualify that.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: From March 1957?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Yes. Since March 1956 we have raised about Rs. 14 crores, and of that 100 per cent. is at present borne by the consumer, and over and above that, Rs. 30 crores are being levied now after March and that will also be borne by the consumer. Whatever imposts you levy, this position will continue as long as the industry enjoys a semi-monopolistic or monopolistic position in the matter of production, because the demand is more than the supply. Owing to this, since 1942, the mills have been able to

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

maintain their profits to a very unreasonable degree, in spite of all the measures and imposts that have been levied on the industry. Therefore, I refuse to believe that, unless some other measures are adopted, this incidence will be passed on to the mills except to the extent of 15 per cent.

In regard to export, there will be some advantage, because at present the mills are realising higher prices in the domestic market. Although they could sell in the export markets, they were selling mainly in the domestic market, because there they were getting higher prices. This should not be allowed to be done, and for that I may suggest to the Finance Minister that, if we want to maintain our exports at 1,000 million yards, then it can only be done if we have the power of requisitioning the stocks of the mills at the Tariff Board prices which are very low but which leave a reasonable margin to the mills. We want to expand our foreign markets, because we want to get foreign exchange, and we can do it only in the case of textiles, jute and tea, and unless we do it, we shall not be able to carry out our development programmes. Therefore, all measures should be adopted to get these stocks at the cheapest prices from the mills and then have them exported, and if the agency of a State Trading Corporation is necessary for this purpose, it should be utilised.

With regard to the incidence falling on the consumer, I will give proof of it. The Bombay Millowners—I need not name them it is reported—have in a meeting resolved that the merchants should bear all the incidence of the duty, and I think they have gone further and reported to have said—they have perhaps circularised individual mills—that no individual mill should ever give any concession. I hope that the Finance Minister will use his influence to ask the mills that they should be prepared to bear a part of the incidence of this duty. He is powerful and I think that knowing the mill-owners as I do, they will act according to his advice. I am definite about it.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA (West Bengal): What about the Ahmedabad mill-owners?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: They have decided to bear the entire extra duty. In

a period of 18 months after he assumed office, the Finance Minister removed the controls. He does not desire controls. He only wants that this extra duty should not be passed on to the consumer. That is the idea behind his proposals.

I think this should be done in a different way. This steep rise in duty of about 100 per cent. in the medium should have been levied in two stages. Half the duty should have been levied just now and half in the month of March. The reason is, the wholesalers and retailers are having stocks with them bearing lesser duty for a period of 4 months and they will not be subjected to this taxation.

With regard to the direct taxation, it is not levied. But this indirect taxation which is levied on one single commodity amounts to Rs. 75 crores—not a small sum. Rs. 75 crores will be the total excise duty realised from textiles.

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: In what period of time?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: In 12 months with the present enhanced rates because in February it was Rs. 30 crores. In March it was raised to Rs. 44 crores, and by the present taxation it is raised to Rs. 74 crores. This as the indirect taxation out of which Rs. 44 crores is levied in six months and my grievance is that there is no corresponding direct taxation levied which he could have very well levied at the same time, as an extra direct taxation by a Supplementary Budget. There was scope for levying that and the reason is that since March the direct taxation which was levied on industry has been too small as noted by the industry. The Finance Minister will note that equity prices of industrial shares have gone up by 20 to 25 per cent., in four months. Their capital has increased. We are talking of equality in income and reducing the disparities. The disparity is widened and there is practically an industrial boom in the country owing to the planned economy which we are having, owing to the small resources that we are having and which we want to conserve to our best advantage. In a planned economy, we cannot carry on in this fashion and in the matter of taxation of industry, we should have an excess profits tax on the capital and reserves—not on any standard basis but on basis of return on the capital and

reserves. Of course the share-holders are entitled to a return on the capital and reserves and they may have a reasonable profit but if they are earning more, the State should draw that up. That is the way to make up the revenues.

As regards the blanket powers taken by the Government for raising this duty, I think these are rather extraordinary. The rise in the coarse and medium duties to four annas instead of two annas levied at present and six annas instead of three annas for fine and super-fine, I think, is a little too much. That incidence is not required even by the handloom industry to protect it because the handloom industry, in my opinion, will be fully protected by the present extra levy of the excise duty coupled with the sales tax which are existing on mill cloth. There is no such tax on handloom. When this is the position, handlooms are quite able to compete and if any rise is required, the rise in duty will be both on the mill cloth and the handloom cloth and neither the millowner nor the handloom weaver should be conspiring to raise the prices in order that the common man may suffer. Therefore these blanket powers are not necessary.

PROF. G. RANGA: Why are you supporting the millowners?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I am not at all supporting the millowners.

PROF. G. RANGA: Why do you coupled the handloom weavers with the millowners?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: When the handloom prices rise, the millowner's profits also rise. Both have to be taxed. I don't say only one should be taxed.

With regard to this I am making this point that we are meeting three times in a year in Parliament and the Finance Minister can very well bring a Bill to raise the duty in time. Only there is a gap of 2 months between each Session. Therefore these blanket powers are not necessary.

Next I will say something about the licensing procedure. At present about 18 lakhs of spindles are licensed and they have been licensed for a long time but they are not coming into operation. What is the reason? People without means or without capital have secured licences perhaps through

influence also. I know that these persons are trafficking in licences, and are trying to sell the licences to others in order that they can get about 10 to 15 per cent. permanent share in profit by selling away or transferring these licences. That system should stop. This is existing not only in the textile industry but in other industries also. I suggest that whenever any licence is given to any industry to be established in the country, a deposit should be levied of 1 per cent. of the capital assets of land and building that are to be created because if this deposit is there then that concern is sure to come into operation and that deposit should be liable to forfeiture if the concern is not putting the orders for machinery within a period of six months.

PROF. G. RANGA: Then you confine it to the monopolists. . . .

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: It will not be because whatever it may be, we don't want developments not to materialise and the expansion of the spindles has not materialised. The licences in June 1955 were for 18 lakhs but very few have materialised. That is the position.

Then one more point which is very important is, if we want to reduce the prices, the best way is to increase production and without increasing production we shall not be able to reduce the prices and that production should be at least 5 per cent. more than the demand and the demand for consumption is rising every year. Now for that production. I feel that unless the new spindles come into operation, the only way is to encourage the working of more spindles in the first, second and third shifts and for that I will give the House some figures as to how this production has increased in the last three years. The production has increased by 600 million yards of cloth by the working in the second shift of more spindle and the working of a much larger number in the third shift. I will give the figures. In 1952 in the second shift 90 lakh spindles were working and in 1956 now; 100 lakhs are working—an addition of 10 lakhs out of which we can take about 6 lakhs of new installations which have increased. The net increase in the second shift is 4 lakhs but the third shift results are very illuminating. In the third shift in 1952 28 lakhs were working and in

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

April 1956, 47 lakhs are working. About 19 lakhs of spindles additional are working although the installed capacity has increased by only 6 lakhs. 13 lakhs more spindles on the basis of eight hour shift are working in third shift and if we look to this additional work and if calculations are made, I am sure that one will find that 600 million yards more production has come from the same installed capacity.

I am suggesting on this account that still there is capacity latent to increase the production by additional second shift working as well as third shift working and that if we take the necessary measures, we can further increase the production by 1,000 million yards which may appear startling to some but I say it with all responsibility. I give that figure because the only way is that there must be a deterrent penal excise duty levied on spindles in order that they can run to their maximum production. In the first and second shifts the excise duty may be there but not on the third, so that those who are working the spindles will be more enthused to work third shifts. I know that there are some disadvantages. Some mills have not got important machinery adequately. To some mills the prices are not remunerative. There is no desire to sell yarn by some mills owing to low profits made by them. Then some mills don't want to wear out their spindles and there are comparatively less efficient units. All these factors are there. If a technical survey is made, it will be possible to bring into use 24 lakhs more spindles in the third shift and with regard to second shift, apart from the closed mills, there are 10 to 11 lakhs spindles which are lying idle and they are idle for various reasons. I think if efficient working is there, then only 5 lakh spindles can be closed in the first two shifts out of the installed capacity. 10 lakhs more spindles can work in the first and second shift and 24 lakhs more in the third shift will easily give an additional production of 800 million yards.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: I want some information from Mr. Parikh. He said that the Bombay Millowners have issued a circular about this. What about the Ahmedabad Millowners? Have they done anything?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I did not want to mention it. What has been done by the Ahmedabad millowners is that

very many of them have agreed to bear the whole extra duty themselves. Therefore I was not mentioning it. Mr. Dasappa has mentioned it.

With regard to the point raised by Mr. Kunzru about the rise in the coal prices and the rise in the transport charges, the incidence of that levy of additional coal and transport charges comes to one-half or three-fourth per cent. on the total cost of cloth. Therefore when the mills are realizing 20 per cent. on the average over their cost price, this incidence is very small.

With regard to the question of having a control on the prices which Mr. Mahanty referred to, I think the Finance Minister who has lifted the controls will not levy them again. He has enough measures in his armoury to have more production and I am confident that with the experience he has and the way in which he has handled the situation in the textile and other industries, he will not have controls but at the same time, I am sure, he will make cloth cheaper. But for all this, time is required.

Lastly, I would submit that if we are levying this excise duty on the first and second shifts, we must consolidate the sales tax with the excise duty, because to have the collection of sales tax separately and the collection of excise duty separately is not a good thing. Abolish the sales tax immediately, say in two or three months and levy this excise duty on the shift basis, for the production of yarn and not for the production of cloth, because the handlooms can well take care of the production of yarn. Whatever yarn is utilised by the mills should be subject to the excise duty on the first, second and third shifts. The rest of the yarn should go to the handloom weavers. If all these measures are adopted I am quite sure even within the present installed capacity we shall have an additional production of 800 million yards. This additional production is capable of meeting all our demands that are likely to come in the next two years and the prices will automatically go down. This is a sort of a cushion, I mean, the number of shifts and the working of more or less spindles in each shift and we will be able to produce sufficient to supply all the demands for cloth in the country.

With these comments and suggestions, Sir, I support this Bill.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I confess I feel somewhat puzzled by this Bill. The hon. Finance Minister says that it is not a taxation measure, that his intention is that the extra-profits which the concerns are making should be mopped up. He has based his case on three grounds. In the first place, he says it is necessary to mop up the extra profits which the mills are making. In the second place it is necessary to restrict consumption and in the third place the measure is desirable from the point of view of exchange, that is to say, that it will restrict the sales in the home market and make exports of cotton cloth more easily possible.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I confess that I look upon this question from a somewhat different angle. We are about to launch on the Second Five Year Plan.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: We have already launched on it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Yes, we have launched on it. We have launched upon the Second Five Year Plan. The whole object of that Second Plan surely is to raise the standard of living of the common man, but if you go on adding to his burdens then his purchasing power will suffer and his standard of living will come down. That will be the inevitable result. It may not be the result intended by the Finance Minister. It may not be the result intended by the Ahmedabad millowners or the Bombay millowners. But the inevitable result of this measure will be to increase the price of cloth so far as the poor man is concerned. Well, we have already austerity living; and the standard of living is even less than austerity living standard so far as the poor man is concerned. I think 10 or 12 yards of cloth is not too much for a person in this country. We have already so many scantily clothed persons in this country. Do we want to add to the number of these scantily clothed persons? It may be said that this will not be the effect. Well, my knowledge of finance is of a very limited character. But economists tell us that indirect taxes are generally passed on to the consumer and cloth is an essential article. So far as the Indian masses are concerned, it is an article of necessity. The demand for it, having regard to the purchasing power of the people, is not of a very elastic character. There-

fore, in taxing it or in raising the tax—and that is really in effect what we are doing—we shall be adding to the burden of the common man. The common man will be justified under those conditions in demanding a revision of his wage structure. You are not improving his wage structure. The wage structure remains where it was in 1951 or thereabout. And yet the common man will have to pay more for his cloth. He may have to pay more for his food also, because food taxes we are having in some States. He may have to pay more for his edible oils and all that. The total sum of all that constitute to be a heavy burden on his budget. Therefore, I think some other, some more scientific—if I may use that word—and some more rational method should have been devised for mopping up these profits. I think, Sir, the question of an excess profit tax on industries which are making large or huge profits cannot in the interest of social justice be ignored very long. I do not see why we should not have a capital gains tax in this country. And when you have done these things, it will be time enough for you to think of taxing the poor man's cloth or taxing the poor man's food.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, it may be that things will shape as Mr. Parikh thinks they are likely to, having regard to what the Bombay millowners and the Ahmedabad millowners say. But in regard to these matters, we have to take into consideration the psychological effect of a measure of this nature on the mass of the people and I venture to think that the psychological effect of this measure upon the masses will not be a healthy one. It will be very difficult for people to explain that this is not really a tax, that it is really intended to restrict consumption, that it is only intended to mop up the extra profits.

If a man goes and tells the voter that this measure is likely to hit the poor man, he is likely to catch his ear. I think the Finance Minister has not approached this whole problem from this angle. I regret that I have to criticise but I think it is desirable that there should be some frank talk on some occasions here. (*Interruption.*) All right on all occasions and I have to say, in a spirit of the utmost friendliness to the measure as we are all going to vote for it in the ultimate analysis—

[Shri P. N. Saprul]

and I would say in all friendliness to the Finance Minister—that this is a measure which is not likely to be liked by the common people who are building high hopes on what the future will have in store for them when the second Five Year Plan fructifies and begins to yield fruits. If the first fruit of the Second Five Year plan is to be—it may be for a period of three months, it may be even for a period of six or it may be even for a period of nine months—arise in the cost of living, then he will not bless us for what we are doing. I think that the richer classes in this country, in the interests of the future generation should be prepared to bear a heavier burden than they are carrying so far. I do not accept the view that the burden of taxation should be fairly distributed among all the members of the community. The terrible fact about our country is that the poor people have no purchasing power; they are not in a position to bear any taxation. It is, therefore, the richer classes, if you like to use the word, who should be mulcted in order that the injustice of centuries might be righted. We have a bad social and economic legacy and unless we are prepared to approach our work or our task in a courageous spirit of forward looking statesmanship, forces which we can only see dimly today may overwhelm us. Therefore, our first concern and our last concern in this House and outside should be the poor man, should be the tiller of the soil and the workers in our factories and the clerks in our Government offices or in our commercial houses. I do not think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that this is a measure which it will be easy to agree to on grounds of social justice and, therefore, I would plead for a revision, if it were possible, of the attitude represented in this Bill.

Thank you.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the hon. Minister, in his own inimitable way, tried his best to make the Bill before the House attractive and acceptable but, Sir, I am afraid I am one of those who have not been able to understand the logic of the hon. Finance Minister in this matter and whether he can succeed in the objects which he attributes to this Bill.

The first thing is, he says that the prices of cloth have been going up, particularly during the last few months and he wants, by this measure, to mop up the extra profit that accrues to the manufacturers or to the wholesalers. Sir, this is a thing which I cannot understand as many others in this House or elsewhere are unable to understand. Mopping up the profits will be possible if a ceiling is put over the prices. That is quite understandable but it is considered that bringing back control over cloth is undesirable because of too many evils that will be brought in its wake and it is rightly considered that there should be no control. The hon. Mr. Parikh said that the Bombay mill owners have decided amongst themselves that they will bear this extra levy and not pass it on to the consumers. Sir, that is a voluntary control and if it is practicable and if it is successful, it may achieve the object of mopping up the profits. I do not know whether the hon. Finance Minister who has been managing things in a very admirable way in many other respects could manage the whole industry, not only in Bombay but throughout the country, so as to make it impose upon itself such a voluntary control as is being spoken of by Mr. Parikh. That is yet to be seen. Anyway, this is not the normal way. The fear now is that this additional duty will be passed on the consumers, particularly to the poorer amongst the consumers which I will show presently by the figures that have been supplied to us and that is the fear that makes friends here as well as elsewhere to be critical about this measure.

Another object which is to be achieved by this measure is restriction on the consumption of cloth. The idea is that the consumption of cloth has been going up rapidly higher and higher, that it is not good to the country and that, therefore, a restriction, a ceiling, must be put over the consumption of cloth. I ask whether it is a proper attitude to take when the slogan is "production and more production, consumption and more consumption". This 'more production and more consumption' is said to be essential and indispensable for the progress that the country has to make in the economic field. Therefore, Sir, is it at all advisable to restrict consumption in this artificial manner by legislation? Let us now see whether production has gone

above any reasonable limits, to any unconscionable extent. Certain figures have been supplied to us by the Finance Ministry along with the Bill under consideration and in para. 4, the figures of availability of cloth *per capita* during the war years are given. For the year 1939-40, the availability *per capita* was 15.75 yards.

For the next year also the same figure is given, and these are during the years of the war period. In the post-war period there is a gradual decline in consumption. In 1953 it comes up to 15 yards. The next year, 1954, also registered the same consumption. Then in 1955 there is an increase and that increase, Sir, is only about .15 yard over the pre-war period consumption. Then in the current year, 1956, it is said that the consumption has gone still higher. And what is the consumption for this year, Sir? Taking six months of this year the consumption is 16.8 yards, that is to say, it is more or less one yard more than the pre-war consumption, and this is said to be a very high consumption, and this consumption is sought to be depressed and brought down by such artificial means. It is said by some friends that it is a temporary measure required for some purpose and particularly for encouraging the export trade. Can the export trade also, Sir, be encouraged and be kept up by such artificial means is not clearly understandable.

Then, Sir, as I said, this levy, it is feared, is going to be passed on to the consumer and I said, Sir, that it will have to be borne by the poorer amongst the population. If we turn to page 5 of the notes supplied to the hon. Members Sir, you will find that the figures of average prices of cloth calculated in annas per pound of yarn woven are given. There it is shown and it is also correct that the prices have gone up for the years shown therein. Now, Sir, we have to note one or two things here. When compared to August, 1953, Sir, the prices of coarse and medium cloth have been going higher and higher. On the other hand the prices of fine and superfine varieties have been going down until January, 1955. Then they go up, the prices for fine and superfine cloth go up to the 1953 level only in January, 1956. That is one thing. The cloth which is consumed by the poorer section of the people has been gradually going up during the period when the superfine

cloth has been going down. Now, Sir, here in the Finance Ministry's Note the appreciation of prices is given in annas, but I think the percentage will give us a clearer idea. I have worked out the percentages of rise in the prices, Sir, for the period under consideration, and they are these. From January 1956 to August of the same year, that is, this year there have been increase

(Time bell rings.)

Only two minutes, Sir. And the increases for the various varieties of cloth, coarse, medium, fine and superfine are these. 18.84 per cent for the coarse variety; 45.13 per cent for medium; 23.01 per cent. for fine and 16.61 per cent for the superfine. Now, Sir, if you compare today's price, that is, the prices in August 1956 with the prices that were obtaining in August, 1953, then we shall have a better idea. I said that the coarse and the medium varieties, during the period of more than two years in 1953 to 1955 have been going up in prices whereas in the case of superfine cloth they have been going down. That is what I said. Now if you take the present rise as, compared to August, 1953, these are the figures, Sir. Coarse has appreciated by 25.83 per cent.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Where do you get these figures there?

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB: I have worked out myself these percentages from the figures which were supplied to us by the Finance Ministry. On page 5 there are the figures. What I am giving is only in terms of percentage and that has been worked out by me. The percentage of rise for medium variety is 68.47 as compared to August, 1953, when fine has appreciated only to the extent of 3.75 per cent. and superfine 16.03 per cent. Sir, from this it can be seen that the varieties which are consumed by the poorer classes of the people have appreciated, much more than the other varieties consumed by the rich people, and if to this is added the present duty, the prices will go higher still for these poorer classes of people.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: When you compare the figures you must remember that foreign cotton was 80 per cent. higher.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB: Yet superfine has not gone up so much. These are the figures given by the department. Taking it from another point of view, Sir, there is the figure for drill bleached and mercerised and the difference between the fair wholesale price worked out on the basis of the Tariff Board formula and the wholesale price now obtaining is 39.23 per cent. That is the coarse variety. Again, now is not the suitable time, the psychological time for bringing forward this measure because we have already heard complaints from Calcutta, from Madras and from other places that when the poorer people who buy their cloth once in a year—and they have saved some money during the year to buy now—and when they are going to buy some cloth these levies are being enforced by which the prices will further increase.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now ten minutes each. There are still ten more speakers.

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण (मम्बई) : उप सभापति महोदय, इस विधेयक का स्वागत करते हुए मुझे कुछ संतोष होता है और कुछ नाराजी भी। संतोष इस बात से होता है कि स्वाभाविक है कि इस विधेयक के कारण हेंडलूम कपड़े की कुछ प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ेगी और खपत भी कुछ बढ़ेगी, साथ साथ खादी को भी कुछ उत्तेजन मिलेगा। परन्तु मुझे अभी तक यह नहीं पता कि डिमांड बढ़ जाने के कारण क्यों ये मिल वाले अधिक मुनाफाखोरी कर रहे हैं, क्योंकि आपको मालूम है कि एक तरफ से डिमांड बढ़ी है, तो दूसरी तरफ से उत्पादन बढ़ा है और उत्पादन बढ़ने के बाद यदि डिमांड बढ़ती है, तो उत्पादन को और अधिक बढ़ना चाहिये और आज मिल वालों को ताकत है कि वे अधिक उत्पादन कर सकते हैं, लेकिन मैं देखता हूँ कि यह जो महंगाई है, यह एक आर्टिफिशियल पैदा हुई है। मैं एक रिपोर्ट पढ़ रहा था और उसमें मुझे यह मिला:

“Had there been reliable statistical data of stocks with trade in India, it might have been possible to show that the fall in the unsold stocks with the mills is due to the speculative purchases of trade, which overbought cotton textiles as a result partly of the prevailing uncertainty of the future supply excise and other levies and partly of the unduly long marriage season last year and the considerable number of marriages this year during a very short period.”

तो इस तरह से आगे की नफाखोरी को खयाल में रखते हुए जानबूझ कर यह कीमत बढ़ाई गई है क्योंकि आप देखेंगे तो आपको पता लगेगा कि अप्रैल के आखिर तक कीमत में कोई खास बढ़ोतरी नहीं हुई थी। मेरे पास ये जो अंक हैं जनवरी, फरवरी, मार्च और अप्रैल के, उससे पता चलता है कि ग्रे शीट का भाव बम्बई में इस प्रकार था : जनवरी में १७ रु० साढ़े ३ आना, फरवरी में १७ रु० साढ़े ३ आना, मार्च में १७ रु० साढ़े ३ आना और अप्रैल में १७ रु० साढ़े ३ आना था। इसी तरह से बहुत सी और व्हेराइटीज के दर भी यहां दिये हुए हैं जिनसे आपको पता चलेगा कि अप्रैल तक इस महंगाई में कोई खास बढ़ती नहीं हुई, परन्तु उसके बाद एक दो महीने में यह कैसे बढ़ गए ? उसका कारण यह है जो कि मैंने अभी पढ़कर सुनाया कि एक तरह से आर्टिफिशियल महंगाई, हमारे इन मिल वालों ने कहिये या व्यापारियों ने कहिये, पैदा की है।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि मैं थोड़ी देर के लिये मान लेता हूँ कि उत्पादन कम है, उत्पादन को हम बढ़ायें। परन्तु उत्पादन बढ़ात वक्त मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय का खयाल कारवे कमेटी की ओर खींचूंगा। कारवे कमेटी ने यह सिफारिश की थी और की है कि जितना अधिक कपड़ा पैदा करना हो, जिसकी जरूरत हो, वह आपको डीसेंट्रलाइजेशन (विकेन्द्रीकरण) के जरिये से ही करना चाहिये। बहुत सी बातें कारवे कमेटी की कही जाती हैं और हमारे माननीय फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी आज कारवे कमेटी का नाम लिया था, परन्तु जो सिफारिशें खास करके कारवे कमेटी ने की उनकी तरफ दुर्लक्ष्य किया जाता है। आप हेंडलूम को ले लीजियेगा। आल इंडिया हेंडलूम बोर्ड के जो आज के वाइस प्रेसीडेंट हैं उन्होंने एक किताब लिखी है। उसमें उन्होंने यह साफ लिखा है कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में जितने भी हेंडलूम्स चल रहे हैं या मौजूद हैं उनको पूरी मदद दी जाय और अगर ऐसा किया गया, तो उनसे ४५०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा पैदा हो सकता है यानी आज की कमी उनसे ही पूरी हो सकती है। आज हमारे हिसाब से १५०० करोड़ गज कपड़ा पैदा होता है और हमारे आल इंडिया हेंडलूम बोर्ड के वाइस प्रेसीडेंट कहते हैं कि हमारे हेंडलूम्स को सरकार से पूरी मदद मिले तो हम ४५०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा पैदा कर सकते हैं। तो ऐसी हालत में मैं नहीं समझता कि आप क्यों नहीं इस डिसेंट्रलाइज्ड उद्योग को उत्तेजन देते हैं।

आज मैं बड़े गौर से डा० कुंजरू का भाषण सुन रहा था, मुझे दुःख हुआ कुछ बातों को सुनकर। उन्होंने जिस वक्त अम्बर चर्खे की बात की उन्होंने यह कहा कि नौ, दस आने के लिए कितने आदमी काम करने के लिए उत्सुक होंगे। उनको पता नहीं कि आज हिन्दुस्तान की क्या हालत है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहूंगा, इस देश में एक करोड़ ४२ लाख आदमी ऐसे हैं जो तीन आने से कम में अपनी गुजर करते हैं और ४ करोड़ ४५ लाख आदमी ऐसे हैं जो छः आने से कम में गुजर करते हैं और १० करोड़ ६१ लाख आदमी ऐसे हैं जो १० आने से कम में गुजर करते हैं। यानी १६ करोड़ आदमी आज ३ आने से १० आने तक में गुजर करते हैं। मैं दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि अम्बर चर्खे से तीन आने, छः आने या दस आने से ज्यादा पैसे मिल सकते हैं। परन्तु सोचना चाहिये कि यह बात क्यों कही जाती है। एक भाई जो बहुत विद्वान हैं, उन्होंने यह कहा कि यह हैंड स्पिनिंग तो प्रिमिटिव बात है। हाँ, बात उनकी निगाह में तो सच है, लेकिन मुझे हैंड स्पिनिंग प्रिमिटिव नहीं मालूम देता। परन्तु हमें तो वे लोग कुछ प्रिमिटिव दिखायी देते हैं, जो यहां बैठे हुए हैं क्योंकि आज हिन्दुस्तान में लाखों आदमी लंगोटी लगाये हैं, लाखों को खाने को नहीं मिलता, लाखों बेरोजगार हैं, उनकी तरफ जिनका खयाल नहीं जा सकता और इन तमाम बातों को जो बर्दाश्त कर सकते हैं वे सब हमको सबसे बड़े प्रिमिटिव नज़र आते हैं।

प्रिमिटिव की बात के बावजूद मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि हमें कोई चर्खे से या अम्बर चर्खे से खास प्रेम है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। परन्तु प्रेम है हमें मनुष्य से, हमें जिंदे जागते मनुष्य से प्रेम है, चर्खे से प्रेम नहीं है। आपको पता होगा कि राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी ने यह कहा था कि यह चर्खा मुझे कोई खास प्यारा है, यह बात नहीं है। मैं इसे जला सकता हूँ यदि आप कोई जरिया बता सकें कि जिससे देश के बेरोजगार लोगों को रोजगार दिलाया जा सकता है। एक जगह उन्होंने यह कहा है :

"I have no partiality for return to the primitive method of spinning, grinding and husking for the sake of them. I suggests the return because there is no other way of giving employment to the millions of villagers who are living in idleness."

मेरे भाई डाक्टर कुंजरू और उनके बाद जो विद्वान भाई बोले, यदि वे कोई रास्ता हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोगों को उद्योग देने का बतलाते तो मैं समझता कोई ठीक बात है। लेकिन जो उन्होंने यह कहा कि १० आने रोज में कौन काम करेगा तो मैं उनसे यह कहूंगा कि आप गांवों में जाकर देखिये, आपको वहां पर चार आने रोज पर भी काम करने के लिये लाखों आदमी मिल जायेंगे। (समय की घंटी) मैं सिर्फ तीन मिनट और लूंगा।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If every hon. Member takes three minutes more it will be 30 minutes. खादी बोर्ड का बिल आ रहा है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : That is a different thing. तो मुझे यह कहना था कि जो यह कहा जाता है कि हमें कपड़े की पैदावार बढ़ानी चाहिये, मैं भी चाहता हूँ कि कपड़े का उत्पादन बढ़े, परन्तु उसका जरिया हैंडलूम हो और सूत बढ़ाने का जरिया अम्बर चर्खा हो। अगर आप कपड़े के लिये मिलों पर ही भरोसा करेंगे, तो बेकारी बढ़ती ही जायेगी।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज करीब १४१ मिलें हैं, जो दो शिफ्ट चलती हैं, एक शिफ्ट खाली है। उसके बाद एक शिफ्ट चलने वाली १६ मिलें हैं और तीन शिफ्ट चलने वाली २२४ मिलें हैं। जब ये तमाम मिलें पूरी ३ शिफ्ट चलने लगे तब तो आज भी कपड़ा बहुत कुछ ज्यादा पैदा हो सकता है। अगर ये मिल वाले, ये भागवान अपनी मिलें पूरी तरह ३ शिफ्ट चलायें तो उनको जो नई स्पिनिंग मिलें खोलने का मोह हो रहा है, टैम्पटेशन पैदा हो गया है, वे इस टैम्पटेशन से बच जायेंगे और हिन्दुस्तान के गरीब भी बच जायेंगे।

इसके बाद एक बात और मुझे आपकी नज़र में लानी है और वह यह है कि आपको अम्बर चर्खे के लिए कितनी सबसिडी देनी पड़ेगी। आप घर में सब तरह से अच्छी हालत में रहते हैं, फिर यदि कुछ लोग अपने बेकार भाइयों के लिए कुछ करते हैं, तो उसके लिये आप क्यों बुरा मानते हैं। मिल वालों को काफी सहायता आज तक सरकार ने दी है, फिर दो चार करोड़ रुपया अम्बर चर्खे की सहायता करने पर आप क्यों नाराज़ होते हैं? मेरे पास सन् १९२६ से १९४६ तक कीफेहरिस्त है, जिसमें दिया हुआ है कि

[श्री देवकीनंदन नारायण:]

सरकार द्वारा मिल वालों को कितनी सहायता दी गई है। मिल वालों ने इस बीच करीब साढ़े ग्यारह सौ करोड़ रुपये की मदद झूटी के कारण सरकार से पाई है। अंदाजा लगाइये कि इस हिसाब से आज तक विलेज इंडस्ट्री और अम्बर चख की कितनी मदद की गई, जिसके लिए आप ताना मारते हैं। आपको यह बात सोचनी चाहिये कि इस देश में आज भी करोड़ों आदमी नंगे, भूखे और बेरोजगार हैं। उनकी निगाह से आप इस सवाल को और हर एक सवाल को देखें, तब आपको पता चलेगा कि हैंडलूम की कितनी जरूरत है। फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब भविष्य में कपड़े का उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहते हैं, मुझे उम्मीद है कि डिसेंट्रलाइज्ड जरिये से ही वे इस बात की कोशिश करेंगे।

3 P.M.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this Bill could be supported.....

DR. R. B. GOUR: Sir, I would request that you give the warning bell at the 7th minute so that the speaker has some time to wind up by the 10th minute.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY :..... only because it brings revenues to the Government and it brings considerable revenues to the Government. Of course this House has no objection to arm the Government with full powers so that they can raise the necessary revenues. I think the question would then be, what incidence will be involved in the powers that we would be arming them with. But as the hon. Finance Minister has said it is not primarily a taxation measure. Although it is a Money Bill, it has not come even certified as a Money Bill. We grant that it is not conceived purely as a measure for raising revenues. But the case for this Bill has been stated like this. The prices of cloth are going up. Why are the prices going up? Because the supply is not keeping pace with the demand. The demand has risen to 16.8 yards and the supply is not keeping pace with that. This is the first assumption. The second assumption is that the manufacturers are making profits and those profits have to be mopped up. If these assumptions are correct, of course, this measure would be justified. Let us see whether the first assumption, that there is not

sufficient availability of cloth in the market, is correct. Personally I feel that 16.8 yards *per capita* is a little inflated figure. Even granting that it is a true figure, there are some more facts which the hon. Finance Minister should have brought before us to convince us of the shortage in the availability of cloth. If you take for instance the table which he has given on page 2 of the hand-out that is given to us, you will find that *per capita* availability in 1950 was 9.7; in 1951 it rose to 11.7 and in 1952 it rose to 14.4. And from 1952 onwards it has gone up to 15 yards *per capita*. If that is so, are we sure that cloth is not produced or cloth is not available in sufficient quantities? Well, Sir, we have worked out in the First Five Year Plan for a *per capita* consumption of 18.5 yards and we knew fully well, when we launched the Plan, that we were injecting a lot of purchasing power into the masses and, therefore, we should have expected a rise in the consumption. But what are the steps we have taken? As has been pointed out, the average Indian is ill-clothed. You can see in the villages twenty per cent. of them go with their *langot*. When that is the case what are the steps you have taken to see that production increases, whether it be in the handloom sector, or khadi sector or in the mill sector? Of course, we need production in all these sectors. The Government have licensed 1.9 million spindles during the past years and as the hon. Mr. Parikh has pointed out, these licences have been long standing and those who have applied for these licences have not taken the least trouble to get the spindles. Why is that so? This is a very significant factor. If naturally the Government had taken care to see that, licenses were issued to the proper parties or had they taken care early to see that pressure was brought on them to instal these spindles, we would not now be in this plight. There is one point which is very significant and it is this. In all textile concerns, I am told, that the return will be calculated on the investment and the investment is on the basis of cost per spindle. Well, the cost per spindle about twenty years ago was far below many times lower than the cost of spindle today, so that when an existing textile concern wants to expand its capacity it does not feel that it is as profitable as when that textile concern was installed at a low cost per spindle. Therefore, I am told that

these industrialists are not very enthusiastic in expanding their capacity. If these 1.9 million spindles, which the Government have licensed and which eventually they thought of cancelling, had been installed, then we would have had plenty of cloth available. I do not know whether these 1.9 million spindles were applied for by the existing textile concerns for expansion purposes or by new applicants for establishing new textile concerns. The break-up is not there. In the absence of the break-up I am right in assuming that at least a good percentage of these spindles were applied for for expansion purposes by the existing textile mill-owners. Whatever that be, there is a sure indication for the Government to consider, even if you want, in the future, cloth production to rise, it must be taken into account. The fact that these licensed spindles have not been used must be taken as an indication that the textile interests will not be very enthusiastic to expand. Well, is this the reason why this measure is brought, I cannot say?

There are some other points which the hon. Minister should have brought to our notice. For instance, the export quota has been falling. Exports have been falling steadily and that much of cloth is available for consumption. In 1954 the export was 810 million yards. In 1955 it was 693 million yards, whereas in 1956 it has come down. The export in the first six months of 1955 was 362 million yards; in the first six months of 1956, it was 342 million yards. Well, there is considerable saving here. That cloth must be available, and where is the available cloth? There are rumours in the market—and it is an open secret—that cloth is being smuggled from India into Pakistan. I would like to ask the Government on this occasion as to what steps they have taken to see that cloth is not smuggled out of India, because if that were exported, it would have brought us foreign exchange. And the cloth while being deprived of being used by Indians is being smuggled out and that is a thing which I would like the hon. Minister to tell me as to what steps have been taken? Whether that is true or not?

Then, again, I will come to the second assumption..... (*Time bell rings.*) Have I taken ten minutes? Only two minutes, Sir. The second assumption is that the profits will be

mopped up. Well, the hon. Finance Minister has admitted that these industrialists are too clever for anybody, for the income-tax.....

SHRI K. S. HEGDE: Even for him.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: They are not fools to yield this revenue to the Government. Of course, I am aware of the point that the hon. Member, Mr. Parikh, made that the Ahmedabad millowners' Association has passed resolution that.....

DR. R. B. GOUR: Because they know they have not to pay.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY.... this duty will not be passed on to the consumer. But if our experience so far is a guide for anything, immediately the Government levies any duty, by whatever little amount it may be the prices rise up. We saw last year the excise duty was levied on soap, and on shoes, etc. We immediately found out in Delhi that the prices of shoes and leather goods soared high and the price of soap soared high. Well, that is the experience of any man. When the excise duty is levied, if the price rises only to the extent of the duty levied, that is something. But the price rises much more than the duty levied, so much so that not only the consumers will have to pay the excise duty, but they will have to pay something extra besides. I would like my experience to be believed. It is an experience which every one of us has.

Sir, one more point. The Government will not be able to mop up the profit, whereas the consumer will be asked to pay all the duty. If somebody is fattened, what is the use of bleeding the man who has not got any blood? At least the Government could have exempted medium cloth from this and then I would have given full support. I am sorry, as hon. Members have pointed out, this is brought forward at a very psychological moment and it upsets the sense of security that the people have. It is neither politically a wise measure, nor economically a sound one.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it has been stated on behalf of the Government that this excise duty will be realised from the industry and trade. It will be evident to you now, after this debate

[Shri Rajendra Prasad Sinha.] in this House, that most of the Members do not agree with the view of the Government. If you look to the press reports which are pouring in from all parts of India, you will find that the incidence of taxation will be passed on to the consumers. That has been the decision of most of the millowners. Now, I was looking into the price increase, after the announcement of this duty, in the Delhi market and I find that in every variety there has been a price increase. Here are the figures:—

Varieties	Rate (30th August, 1956)	Rate (4th Sept. 1956)
Coating (India United)	Re.-/11/3	Re.-/11/6 per yard.
Coating (New Great)	Re.-/11/10½	Re.-/12/3 per yard.
Check (Pratap)	Rs.12/6/-	Rs.12/14/- 2½ Ydsrd.
Latha Grey	Rs.1/4/-	Rs.1/5/- per yard.

Thus you will find that every variety of cloth has gone up after the announcement of the duty.

Therefore, I am certain, Sir, that this tax will be passed on to the consumers and will not be realised from the industry or the trade as is claimed by the Government. Sir, I understand that there is an outstanding contract of 1½ lakh bales in Bombay and 50,000 bales in Ahmedabad, and according to the contract the millowners are insisting that the dealers must pay the excise duty. Now this is the contract.

SHRI P. D. HIMATSINGKA: That is the law also.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: That is the law. If the Government were really keen to realise it from the millowners, then they should have had a clause in this Bill declaring all the outstanding contracts null and void. Then the dealers would have come forward and would have contracted from day to day after studying the market position, because they would always be apprehensive of the enhancement of the duty as is provided here. But what will happen now is this, that the millowners will pass it on to the dealers and the dealers will pass it on to the consumers. I would like to make it absolutely clear that I am not against taking away the excess purchasing power that may be available with the people in order that we may restrict consumption and invest in development. I know, Sir, that we

cannot develop the country unless we increase our investment potential. But such a taking away of the purchasing power of the people must be preceded by taxing the excess profits that the big millowners have, windfall profits, as a result of our developmental expenditure. You have not done so. You merely make a statement; a statement which does not convince us, that this extra excise duty will be realised from the trade and industry. Here is my hon. friend who is a big textile magnate, who says that 85 per cent of the duty will be passed on to the consumers. Here is "Eastern Economist", a journal of repute—of course a journal which is practically owned and financed by big industry—it has calculated and according to it 50 per cent of the excise duty will be passed on to the consumers. Therefore, what I plead, Sir, is this that this is a very obnoxious measure brought forward at a time when the people will be out to make purchases for their Diwali, Dusserah and Sankranti festivals.

The other point urged on behalf of the Government is this that it will curtail consumption. I would like to examine how far this claim is worth accepting. Now, Sir, you will find that in 1955 the cloth available for consumption was about 6,000 million yards. Taking an average price of Rs. 0-10-10 per yard, this will come to about Rs. 400 crores. Even if we say that 50 per cent. of the duty is passed on to the consumers, the consumers will be paying Rs. 15 crores as excise duty. So, the cost will be Rs. 415 crores for the 6,000 million yards of cloth that is being consumed today in India. I am talking of 1955 figures alone. Now, you will see that the cost of cloth that is being consumed today will rise from Rs. 400 crores to Rs. 415 crores, which means a rise in the price of 3-7 per cent. Now, I want to spend the same amount on cloth. Then what I will do is to reduce my consumption of cloth by 3 per cent. Working out the price, I will reduce my consumption of cloth by 3 per cent, which means that on an all-India basis the consumption of cloth will go down by 180 million yards. If everybody wants to spend the same amount on his cloth budget, the same amount which he was spending before the imposition of this tax, the curtailment in the consumption of yardage will be 180 million yards in the place

of the consumption of 6,000 million yards which is the figure for 1955. This is a marginal reduction in the consumption which will have absolutely no effect upon the price level. So, this claim, this tall claim on behalf of the Government that this will lead to inhibition of the consumption of cloth and thereby reduction of the total yardage of consumption is not worth the scrutiny.

AN HON. MEMBER: Margins will control the prices.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: This 180 million yards will not have any effect. The hon. Minister has pinned his faith on the economic theory of the consumer's resistance or, what is called, the law of diminishing returns. This is a very very uncertain factor. You cannot say "here is a point where the law of diminishing returns will operate, here is the line of the consumer's resistance." It is all the more difficult to determine this point when you are giving large doses of deficit financing. On the one hand you are increasing the purchasing power of the people, on the other hand you say that the consumer's resistance will operate. This is not a factor which should be relied upon. Now, Sir, I maintain that this measure will lead to the tendency of hoarding by dealers. Why is it so? I have got one hundred bales. I know the prices will go up. There would be fresh imposition of tax because you are not taxing all at a time, you are taking a blanket power to tax. Now, if I hoard these one hundred bales, I will stand to gain when a fresh taxation is imposed.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: If it is reduced, what will happen?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: No. There is going to be no question of reduction when there is always a shortage of cloth.

DR. R. P. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): That has never been done.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I would like them to put a restriction on bank advances against cloth bales, as you have done in the case of rice. This has shown good results. Why should not the Reserve Bank impose restriction on advances on cloth bales?

This is my submission that this measure should be accompanied by a restriction on advances against cloth bales.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARAMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I feel it very difficult to be enthusiastic about this Bill, rather I may say, even to find out why it was necessary to introduce this Bill at all. If there was any shortage of funds in the revenues, there were other ways of making it up. In fact the way this Bill has come, having been sprung as it were as a surprise, shows that Government also have been caught napping. Otherwise, Sir, I feel that it should have been possible for Government to know during all these months what was happening and to have devised better ways and means, because I remember, Sir, either during the course of replies to questions or during the speeches on one of the Bills—I cannot exactly remember when—the Commerce Minister saying that permission was given for more power looms and more mills to be opened, and that the extra cloth thus produced in the mills would be sealed accordingly for export only. If that was so this cloth should not have found its way into the market. If the demand for cloth from outside had ceased, those merchants should have come for permission to the Government for releasing this extra cloth in the market. That makes one suspicious whether this cloth has really come into the Indian market, because it is very difficult for me at least to understand, when the prices of foodgrains are going up, when there is so much unemployment, when there are so many thefts, etc., taking place due to economic hardship, that it would be possible for people in the country to buy up so much cloth or become suddenly very enthusiastic about cloth. One wonders whether this cloth is being purchased by anti-social elements, merchants, and it is then finding its way out and depriving Government of its duty in both ways. Something has to be done and enquiries made as to what is happening to this cloth because the two conditions in the country—the economic condition of the people with the rising prices of grains and their sudden capacity to buy so much cloth and absorb what is being produced for the external market—are in my opinion irreconcilable.

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

Then the Finance Minister was pleased to say that public co-operation—something about it has come in the papers also—would be sought in order to make people aware of the need to hold back their purse in buying extra cloth so as to keep down the prices, and again in another breath he has said that fair price shops would not succeed because people would buy cloth and sell it in the black-market. If he is so sure of getting public co-operation, why is he diffident that fair price shops would not work successfully? I would like to say that, if Government really means to ask the people to practise austerity measures by not buying cloth even during the Puja holidays and others for teaching a lesson to these profiteering wholesalers and other mill people, then Government should ask those very people to come forward and practise austerity measures with regard to their purchases also and make a success of these fair price shops. In fact, Government should realise by now that there is no other way of keeping down the prices, because they have been defeated again and again by anti-social elements in the form of these merchants and wholesalers. They should realise that unless there are fair price shops, prices cannot be put down, especially when Government is not prepared to introduce controls so far as prices are concerned.

I would like to draw the attention of the House here to a very interesting cartoon that has appeared in the *Shankar's Weekly* today, and that really describes the position of how the cloth prices will affect the consumer and how the private sector, particularly the capitalists, the textile millowners and the wholesalers would benefit from them. In the cartoon the Finance Minister is seen holding the surgeon's knife in his hand in order to perform an operation on the consumer who is shown as almost in his last breath, reduced to a skeleton, but still the operation is to be performed on him. He is almost in a shrieking condition. The private capitalist, the bloated merchant, is shown looking at this operation from behind the screen, somewhat pleased within himself at the prospect of the operation. That is exactly what is happening. That in a way is the real state of affairs. It cannot be denied that whatever the measures that the Government might

adopt, this duty will affect only the consumer. Whatever promises the millowners may give—and they are always profuse in giving promises,—whatever the measures that the Government introduce to thwart the capitalists will be thwarted by the capitalists; they are so clever.

One more thing I would like to say with regard to this Bill, and that is the apparent contradiction in the measures adopted by the Government in the different Ministries. You see on one side the relief to be given to unemployment by means of a subsidy to khadi, and on the other the way in which power looms and mill spindles are not only increased but some care is taken to see that they are put on their feet as if but for these measures, they would die out. After all, it is a very simple thing which every man in the street understands that, if unemployment is to be relieved, that can only be through the handloom. So, nothing should be done at all for a fixed period of five or six years which would contradict this policy and defeat this particular aim of the Government, i.e., relieving unemployment through the production of handloom cloth. The Planning Minister was pleased to say the other day that they had now set up what is called a co-ordinating department for the various Ministries. I ask the Finance Minister whether the Planning Ministry was consulted by his Ministry, because the Planning Minister said that they have set up a co-ordinating department so as to see that the policies of the different Ministries do not clash, and whether he asked them whether this type of measure should be introduced to make up, as they have said, for the shortage in revenue. It is apparent that this should not have been done. If they had consulted them, at every stage this situation would not arise when Members would be compelled to say that something is being done which would defeat the object which some other Ministry has in view.

Sir, I would also like to ask the Government for a reply with regard to the point that I had raised about how, with the cost of grains going up, people have more money in their pockets for buying cloth. I would also like to ask the Finance Minister, if there is so much extra cloth, why Government is allowing import of cloth. After all, with Japan's re-entry into the market, it was realised that not only in our

country but also in England that the cloth situation would become difficult. This should have been realised even in the beginning. So, for these reasons, I feel that this Bill which has been sprung as a surprise should have been considered in greater detail and an alternative remedy to this excise duty should have been thought of to meet the situation. Thank you.

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, so many friends are wondering why an excess profits tax has not been imposed or is not proposed to mop up these profits. But I am not quite sure whether it is not in the offing at all. If it is in the offing, this may not be the proper time, and possibly that may be the reason why it has not come up before us. Now, the Government has not said that the consumers are not going to bear a portion of this. They say that the consumer also will have to pay and therefore the consumers can be persuaded in that way to reduce consumption of cloth and to that extent, decrease the pressure on the cloth supplies and also in that way contribute towards preventing any further rise in the prices of cloth. Therefore, it is no good our criticising now that the consumers are going to be hit, because the Government has admitted it. The only thing is: Are the Government wise in thinking of raising this excise duty so highly on the medium counts cloth? It is for the Government to consider this once again. If it is too late for them to reconsider it at this stage, at least at the earliest possible opportunity when they come back to this House, they can bring forward an amending Bill, after giving their best thought to it. Either they can reduce this duty, or they can assure a sufficient supply of what is known as utility cloth for the use of the people. During the war and during the period of the controls we used to have that cloth. I would like steps to be taken by the Government in order to get this kind of utility cloth produced so that at least the lower middle classes and the working classes can be helped.

If they don't purchase, it is nobody's fault. Such of those as are willing to purchase will go in for it. In regard to fair price shops, the hon. Ministers has already given the answer. If there are trade unions or some other institutions which are prepared to make themselves responsible for the proper distribution and utilization of this cloth, then fair price shops are likely to be

started by the Government. I see one very great opportunity now for all those people who are engaged today in the handloom weaving industry and also the Khadi industry. It is more or less a kind of a challenge to them. An opportunity is given now through this price differential to maximise their own production and place it at the disposal of the consumer and in that way come to the rescue of the public as well as the Government by increasing the total supplies and also put a kind of pressure on further rise in price of mill-cloth, and also serve the consumer. I wish to assure the House that so far as the handloom weaving industry is concerned, all the non-official Members on the Handloom Board were unanimous in saying that during the next two years the target placed before them, that they should be prepared to produce more than 270 million yards of additional cloth, can be and will be reached by these people, but at the same time they have placed some demands before the Government. They are not impossible demands also. All the Finance Secretaries of the different States, together with the representatives of the Finance Ministry and the Reserve Bank sat together some time last year and they came to the conclusion that instead of Rs. 100 as working capital that is being supplied to our weavers within the co-operative fold, as much as Rs. 300 as working capital should be advanced to these people, interest free. In addition to that, I suggested and the Handloom Board Members also suggested that this facility should also be extended to all these weavers, and they are 75 per cent. of the total weaving population, outside the co-operatives so that they can also be helped to have some working capital and maximise their production. That alone will not be enough. Then for the three or four months in a year during which they have to go on piling up their stocks, they have to be provided additional capital. That is also needed. These additional facilities are not impossible to be satisfied because of two reasons. The Reserve Bank of India has agreed to this, the State Bank has also agreed and the State Governments also have agreed. I want the Government to take special steps to implement these recommendations. Otherwise it will not be possible for the handloom industry to satisfy the demands that are being made on them.

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

Coming to the Khadi industry, I would like to endorse all that has been said by my hon. friend Shri Deokinandan Narayan and I would like to the House to keep in mind two particular facts here.

The Planning Commission itself have stated that there is need for this country to provide additional employment to the unemployed people to the tune of 45,000, . . . that is, through cottage and small scale industries. Is it unfair on the part of all these unemployed people in this country and also for the citizens of this country to expect the House to agree and also the consumer to agree—not only the consumer but also the millowners and others—to pay the necessary subsidy in order to help our unemployed people to come to be employed? My hon. friend Dr. Kunzru was making a great point that these people would be able to earn only twelve annas per day after working for 8 hours. Twelve annas may mean much to some. I may tell you that there are lakhs and lakhs of people who would be glad if you are able to provide them employment in the villages and give them only four annas. If you can offer twelve annas wage on Ambar Charkha, certainly the country should be happy and these unemployed people, anyhow, ought to be happy and would be happy.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Does the hon. Member know that the wages of labour even in the villages now is Re. 1 per day and you cannot get labour for a lesser amount than that?

PROF. G. RANGA : I am myself a peasant.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: But you are getting Rs. 21 per day.

PROF. G. RANGA: May be, I may be getting Rs. 21 when I am here. When I am not a Member here, I have to depend on my land and I am cultivating my own lands and I pay to the agricultural labourer. There are days when I give Rs. 2 and also days when I pay Rs. 2-8. There are hundreds of days in a year—let me tell you—at least 100 days in a year, when the agricultural labourer in my village does not get even eight annas a day. That is the position with regard to the wages. When we take the women, they are

not able to get even six annas a day. That happens to be the case for nearly 100 days in a year in the villages. What is the use of our talking through our hats by remaining in this House and drawing our Rs. 21? These are the conditions. That is why the Planning Commission here says that the impact on the two-fold problem of unemployment and under-employment will not be a large as the situation demands—the impact of all the creative work, constructive work that you are going to create in this country, as a result of the Second Five Year Plan. Therefore the Second Plan is not going to be the full solution of your unemployment problem in this country. That is the reason why I am prepared to support this Ambar Charkha. Improve it, increase its technical capacity and efficiency, by all means but at the same time you have to take care to see that it is not the Ahmedabad workers who have to be kept in your mind. It is the village unemployed people who have to be kept in your Millions and millions of men and women and their old under-nourished, under-clothed, not people—men and women—are going for a day or two but for several days, and these are the people whom you have to keep in mind.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: May I interrupt.

PROF. G. RANGA: I have my ten minutes only. I am not in the habit of asking the Chair for more time. That is why I am concluding.

These are the people whom we have to keep in mind. These are to be provided with additional employment. If my friends—all these people—who are opposed to Ambar Charkha or Khadi or Handloom, can think of something else, they can.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Where is the yarn?

PROF. G. RANGA: Produce more yarn on Ambar Charkha: If you don't want it, then you cannot have yarn. If you don't have yarn, even on handloom you cannot have more cloth. Here are weavers, more than 10 million (*Time bell rings*). Most of them are not able to get enough even for 15 days in a month. They are prepared to work every day. They are prepared to work for 8 to 10 hours a day.

They are having so much starvation and under-nourishment that they would willingly work. Where is the work to offer? Therefore have more Ambar Charkha, subsidise it. You cannot get all these things without paying for it. All this time in this country, according to Mahatmaji's calculations and our calculations also—some of us as economists—fifty million people have been unemployed. You have not thought of them, you have not paid them, you have not maintained them. You did nothing. Those were the days when the British were ruling. Therefore the Government was irresponsible. This is a responsible Government. Therefore it has taken courage in both hands and this is the right time also. All credit to this Government that it has, on the eve of the elections, had the courage to come forward in this Parliament to propose a seemingly unpopular Bill and if it had not been for this Second Plan and the First Plan, I would have been the first person to condemn the Government for coming forward with this Bill. Under these circumstances, I am prepared to support this.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Bill has to be very carefully examined, because it involves certain principles of economics. Mere wishful thinking or merely side-tracking the issue and suggesting certain other things will not solve the problem. The problem before us is this. It is a non-controversial statement that prices of cloth are going up and there can be no other reason for it except the shortage of cloth. It is after all a question of supply and demand. In this situation it is a well-known fact that somehow or other, the consumption of cloth has gone up and there is greater demand for cloth. And when there is this demand for more and more cloth and when there is not enough cloth to go round, naturally the price of cloth goes up. In this situation, it is very right that the hon. Minister and the Government should take immediate steps for increasing the production of cloth. It is very right that the use of Ambar Charkha should be adopted and the production of handloom cloth should be encouraged. All that is absolutely right. But that does not solve the problem of this Bill. The problem of this Bill is that at the present moment there is shortage of cloth. Of

course, the Government is making every effort to increase the production of cloth. But just now, on account of this shortage of cloth, prices are going up. A suggestion has been made, that there should be price control. But it has been the experience of all countries that when there is price control without control on the distribution of the commodity, it has not been successful. You may say that the price of cloth is controlled. But immediately you control the price, the cloth will go underground and the shopkeeper will say that he has no cloth. Only there is the controlled price, but the cloth is not available. Therefore, whenever you control the price, you have to control the distribution also. The two things go together. I am not for control of price without control of the distribution. Unless you have adequate control on the distribution of cloth, there is no point in suggesting any control on the price of cloth.

Naturally in the market these fluctuations go on and the prices of cloth go on increasing up to a certain limit. At that point resistance will start; the purchaser's resistance will start. The purchaser will say that the price has risen to such an extent that he cannot buy it. Now, the problem before the Government is that the price of cloth is going up. I have said before that the Government is making every effort to increase the production of cloth, but you cannot control the price of cloth by just passing an order, because it will not be effective. It will be a cause for ridicule by being ineffective. So in a rising market, when prices are rising, if you levy an excise duty, the prices will continue to rise. Whether the price is rising due to the levy of the excise duty or whether it is rising due to the normal course, after some time, it will reach a resistance point, the point where the purchaser's resistance starts. There will be a point where the purchaser will begin to resist the market and the moment he begins to resist the market, the demand will come down, and the moment the demand comes down, the price will reach an equilibrium. That is called the price equilibrium. Unless and until you reach that price equilibrium, a mere statement or wishful thought, that from tomorrow we are going to fix the price and the price will become stationary at that point, will not work. It is a question of normal supply and

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

demand. Questions of economics are never settled by legislation. No legislation will solve fundamental problems of economics. In a rising price market, the Government should make every effort for increasing the production of cloth. But for the time being, if you levy an excise duty, whether the price rises on account of the excise duty or on account of the demand being greater than the supply, the price will go up. At that stage the Government will have to take other steps also. For instance, they should see that there are no advances made by banks on cloth, so that cloth is not hoarded up and an artificial shortage created in the market. That step can be taken. Then there are other steps. After all our imports and exports and all these things are regulated.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR) in the Chair.]

The result will be that the maximum price level will be quickly reached and then this excise duty, this additional excise duty will be entirely borne by the producer and not by the consumer. The hon. Minister has said that this is a tentative measure and he will watch carefully the position. I am sure if he finds that a large part of this excise duty is being transferred to the consumer, he will take other steps. He cannot in advance tell us all the steps that he is going to take in order to see that the duty is not transferred to the consumer. Mr. Parikh made a suggestion or a guess. He made a guess and said that in his opinion, after April, 85 per cent of this excise duty is going to be transferred to the consumer. Mr. Parikh may be right in his judgment. But I do not think that this duty will continue till April. I think very soon, measures connected with the increased production that have been taken, will result in the increased production of cloth. And with more production of cloth, the prices will come down. The price of this commodity will be automatically reduced and there will be no excise duty on this commodity.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): Another wishful thinking.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Well, it is after all surmising, for nobody can say exactly how things are going to happen and whoever surmises well and is able to give you a correct estimate, he can

be considered to be right and the other man to be wrong.

Next I come to the bogey that has been raised that this excise duty is being levied on certain sections of the people who are not able to bear the burden. Sir, there are two main taxes. There is the income-tax and there is the excise tax. Income-tax is not levied on any person whose total annual income is less than Rs. 4,200 that is to say Rs. 350 per month. Those getting less than Rs. 350 per month do not pay any income-tax. In this category there are two groups of people. There is the group of people whose earning is below Rs. 100 per month and there is the other group whose income is more than Rs. 100 but less than Rs. 350. There are a number of families in the rural areas whose earning is below Rs. 100 per month. Now, let us consider the rural areas. Our average cloth consumption is 16 yards per head. So in a family of five members, the average consumption of cloth is 80 yards per year. It may be 80 or 82, for there is a decimal point also, but I am taking it as a round figure of 80 yards. If that is the average, then in the rural population, among the extremely poor people, it must be below the average. It will not be as high as the average. All the arguments of the hon. Member who says that there are many who are semi-clad, who are badly clothed, they are all absolutely right. I have nothing to say about that. I am only discussing this question from the economic point of view. If 80 yards is the average consumption in a family of five members then in the rural areas it cannot be more than 50 yards per year. And out of this 50 yards, at least 50 per cent or 25 yards may be handloom cloth and that means only 25 yards will be mill cloth. And if in that cloth there is a coarse dhoti or saree, it will be reduced still further. It may be only 20 or 25 yards of mill cloth on which he has to pay duty, and it works out to the additional amount of about Rs. 1-4. That is to say, supposing that the entire duty is transferred to the consumer and also supposing that the 50 per cent. cloth that he purchases is of medium count, then the additional duty he has to pay comes to Rs. 1-4 per year for a family of five. Do the hon. Members think that this amount of Rs. 1-4 is too much? If they say that it is an excessive charge, that it is a very heavy burden on the poor consumer, then I

have nothing more to say about it. It is a matter of fact that people who earn between Rs. 100 and Rs. 350 a month who are the main targets of all excise duties. At the time of the Budget discussion I said that all kinds of excise duties will have to be increased in this country. We will have to progressively make these people who are between the limits of Rs. 100 and Rs. 350 per month and who are exempt from income-tax, to contribute to the revenues indirectly in the shape of excise duties. You will agree that this is the case whether it is shoes, whether it is soap, whether it is cloth. And I think when they are exempt from income-tax there is no justification or reason why they should not contribute something. After all, we are going to get Rs. 17½ crores. Hon. Members by some calculation have said that the consumer will be paying Rs. 15 crores, and yet they have agreed that only half the duty will be collected from them. That means that out of this sum of Rs. 17½ crores, about Rs. 8 crores will be paid by the producer, if we assume that half of it is transferred; and that Rs. 8 crores will be paid by those people whose incomes are between Rs. 100 and Rs. 350 a month. I do not see why they should not pay this excise duty. They are not paying income-tax or any other tax.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR): You have one minute more.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Therefore, I submit that I am not against an excise duty, provided it is properly levied after due consideration and after due examination to see that the burden does not fall on that section of society which is exceedingly poor. We have an excise duty on matches. Hon. Members can ask: "Why should there be an excise duty on matches?" There is an excise duty on salt and on so many other things. So I maintain that this is a reasonable Bill. I do not know why it has been opposed. I think it is a necessary Bill. We have to remember that the price of cloth will rise because it is dependent on supply and demand position.

Government cannot control it. Price control will not affect it because the moment you have any price control, cloth will go underground. So, I will say that this is a harmless Bill and it has been unnecessarily opposed.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to wholeheartedly support this Bill. In this matter, we of the Congress Party are fully familiar with the history of this dispute about the looms, spindlage and Ambar Charkha, and the present Finance Minister, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, is the last person to be blamed for the shortages that have come in here. I think we must give him full marks for the fact that he realised or rather he visualised beforehand that there would be an increased demand and that there would be a shortage later on and, to that extent, he issued licences for, I think, about a lakh of spindles or something like that. This created a furore among those who were opposed to the expansion of the mill industry. There were some hon. Members who were saying that there is a sort of monopolistic state of affairs so far as mill production is concerned but, Sir, who is to blame for that? After all, it was these very people who put political pressure on the Government and said that no further expansion should be permitted in the mill sector and it is the outcome of that pressure that there is in fact today a sort of monopolistic state of affairs, that is to say, those mills that are existing have got today the monopoly and they can dictate their terms; they have got the sellers' market. The fact of the matter is that the demand has risen but the supply is not able to meet the demand. I have just made a few calculations. Production, as given in the Ministry's note, in 1955 was 598 crore yards; population being 37,75,00,000, the *per capita* share comes to 15.9 yards. Now, from January to July, the figure is 371 crore yards and the calculation made is that for the whole year, it will be 638 crore yards. If we take the present level of 17 yards *per capita* then we require at least 657 crore yards but actually we have reached that level—today's level is 16.9 yards *per capita*—and in the other months that are to come, with the demand for the Puja holidays, with the demand for the Diwali and with the demand for the Sankranth period—the demand is likely to increase—the average ought to be taken at 18 yards but even taking the average as 17.5 yards *per capita* the total demand is 676 crore yards as against the production both of mill and handloom cloth to the tune of 636 crore yards. Basing our calculations on the figures supplied by the Ministry, the demand will be 676 crore yards

[Shri J. S. Bisht.]

against a production of 636 crore yards, that is to say, a shortfall of 40 crore yards which in turn means roughly a shortfall of 5.9 per cent., or 6 per cent. of the production. Now, Government has also given certain other figures in which it shows the various areas and the *per capita* consumption of those areas. Now, it is an ordinary economic proposition—and I agree with my friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, on that point—that the prices do not rise up to the sky; sky is not the limit. There is always a point where consumer resistance develops. Even if you do not put in this law or any other controls, the prices cannot rise so very high. If the price is Rs. 1-4 today, it may rise to Rs. 1-8 or Rs. 1-12 or Rs. 2 or Rs. 2-4 but then there comes the limit where the consumer resistance develops and brings about the courage or depress what is called in economic jargon the propensity to consumption. It is there and it has to be balanced by every man in his own private purchases. Mr. Mahanty was using words like 'black act', this act and that act and all that sort of thing. I put this question pointedly to him, "Will the price rise or will it not?" and there was no answer.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: On account of what?

SHRI J. S. BISHT : If the demand has risen, as is evident from the figures we are short by about 40 crore yards at least for the whole year, then the prices must also rise and if the prices rise, what Government is doing is to take only a share. Prices must rise only up to the limit the consumer resistance develops and brings about the equilibrium. Now, what Government does is to take in a share of that rise in prices. I do not see what harm there is in what Government is doing.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: The question is, can it be controlled or not?

SHRI J. S. BISHT : It cannot be because we will have to bring in the whole of price control machinery, that machinery which was a fruitful source for corruption, blackmarketing, nepotism and all the rest of it.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: May I ask one question? Does the hon. Member mean to suggest that such matters like spiral increase in prices are something

beyond human control and are a matter of destiny?

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Now, nobody suggests that it is beyond human control but we have our experience about this and the day Government lifted control, people of this country celebrated it as a day of liberation. We do not want that. Even today, if you ask the average man as to whether he wants control or a little increase in prices, I think unhesitatingly he will vote for a slight increase in price and for this piece of legislation. He does not want to stand at the doors of little bureaucrats for the permit he should get; if he gets a permit and goes to the shop, the thing is not there or if something is there, if he wants medium superfine will be available. All this sort of *golmal* and *gadbad* comes in and so nobody wants it. Let there be a little price increase. As Mr. Kishen Chand said, if the price is Rs. 1-4, it may increase by two or three annas and the common man will not mind this increase. He would prefer this as against the control that my hon. friend, Mr. Mahanty, wants to clamp down on the country.

Therefore, I submit that this particular measure is an innocuous and a harmless one and in the circumstances of today is very necessary.

After all, we want development and we want development very quickly but it has to be development with some stability. That is a point which I have been emphasising every time. I emphasised this at the time of the discussion of the second Five Year Plan. After all, why has the demand risen today? It has risen because we are spending almost double the amount of money that we used to spend in the year 1950 or 1949. All this additional money that comes in and all the deficit financing that you create must create this additional demand and as all the reports show, as the economic experts said very clearly, the first line where the maximum pressure is felt is food and clothing. With regard to food, we know that prices rose for which we have made arrangements with the U. S. A. and all the deficiency in the supply will be met. This also saves us foreign exchange but you cannot adopt that policy in the matter of cloth because we have not got the foreign exchange to import it from other parts of the world.

An argument was advanced, perhaps by Mrs. Savitry Nigam or somebody else here, that at least medium cloth should not be taxed. If you are not to tax medium cloth, then you can as well withdraw the whole of the Bill; it has no meaning because, practically 80 per cent. of the tax will come from medium cloth and as my hon. friend, Mr. Kishen Chand, pointed out very rightly, medium cloth is used by the middle income group which is also exempted from income tax and there is absolutely nothing wrong in it. When you want money for development, you must tap these sources because excise is the one branch from which you can get the maximum amount of taxation and at the same time, doing the least harm to the people.

There was another argument raised by Pandit Kunzru; he wanted the hon. Finance Minister to say clearly what Government's policy was going to be in regard to mill cloth. This is also a matter which strikes me because we must be very clear in this matter. I think my hon. friend, Mr. Deokinandan Narayan—he is not here now—practically in fact accused Pandit Kunzru of being primitive. I do not know what he meant by this term. Even the hon. Prime Minister said very clearly yesterday that we are for improved technology. We cannot just freeze ourselves to a primitive type of technology and all that. He took objection to people insisting on primitive things. I do not know what he means but we must be very clear on this point. I want that the handloom industry should be encouraged. But at the same time you must give them good mill-made yarn, that is to say, the cloth supplied to the average man must be of good quality, and if you can by any means devise a sort of Ambar Charkha, which can be worked on, say, electricity or something, which can spin out even yarns of the required standard and toughness and uniformity, so much the better. Of course you can then encourage all this sort of industry, but you should not force down this sort of thing on the people, as Shrimati Nigam was saying that the Finance Minister should evolve a policy by which every man should be compelled to buy a certain amount of this handloom cloth with the mill cloth. That was tried some time during the war when people used to say that you must purchase a certain

quantity of standard cloth, what was called utility cloth, but this much I know that at least in the U. P. it was a complete failure; nobody would buy it at all. This sort of thing you cannot force down on the consumer, because there is what is called the consumer preference. You may take a mare to a pond, but you cannot make it drink. Such is the case with the consumer. He has got his own preference. It is his own money. He wants the stuff that he likes, that will give him satisfaction, that is to his gratification.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR): Mr. Bisht, no more point please.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Very well, please. Therefore I submit, Sir, that the Bill is all right. Only I want to make one last point.

Now the hon. Finance Minister has been pressed with regard to the clamping down of the excess profits tax in this particular line. I am not in its favour. Now we have got this Prof. Kaldor's report. I think the hon. Minister is making a proper study of it and if he wants to have any taxation in this line, it must be on a proper and scientific basis. This sort of spasmodic or arbitrary action suggested that because we are to-day raising some excise duty on cloth, therefore we must clamp down the excess profits tax is a very unscientific method, and it will not have the desired effect.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill even after the two speeches, both of Mr. Kishen Chand and Mr. Bisht who, I thought, would oppose the Bill but they supported the Bill.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Mr. Govinda Reddy also.

DR. R. B. GOUR: That was opposition in practice, but support at the end.

Sir, the purpose with which the hon. Minister wants us to support this Bill is two-fold. (1) He thinks that by imposition of this levy he will be able to mop up the excess profits of the textile magnates. (2) He thinks that by this levy he would be able to divert some of the textiles produced in this country to exports so that we earn some of our foreign exchange.

[Dr. R. B. Gour.]

Sir, I am afraid the first purpose with which the hon. Finance Minister thinks that this Bill should be supported cannot be met by this particular measure. This excise duty, Sir, cannot mop them up. It has been said so in this House and it is just this morning some of us have received a memorandum from the merchants themselves and that memorandum says that this excise duty is certainly not going to mop up the excess profits of these magnates. For example they say that the higher excise duty, whatever it is, will be added on to the ex-mill price, that the whole thing will be passed on to the wholesaler; the wholesaler will pass it on to the retailer and the retailer will pass it on to the consumer. So in the final analysis it is the consumer who is to pay this higher duty. Therefore my friend, Mr. Sinha from Bihar, was absolutely right when he said that this is going to mop up what he called "the extra purchasing power" in our country. So this excise duty may very well attack the purchasing power but will surely not attack the profits. Sir, it is quite true that the profits of the textiles have increased and it is also quite true, as the discussion here and the discussion in the other House revealed, that the textiles are creating a problem for the Government.

Sir, the profits of these textiles are very heavy. The earning index of the textile factory has increased from 356 in 1950 to 379 in 1953 and later on in 1954 and 1955 the profits had further increased. Sir, the Finance Ministry Note itself says that the cost of production has not increased. It has not increased; that they have said in their Note; that their cost of production has not increased whereas their profits have increased. I would also suggest to this House, Sir, that the worker who was getting Rs. 971 per year in the year 1950 was only getting Rs. 1,116 in the year 1953. Not only that, Sir. In the year 1952 the worker got Rs. 1,122 whereas in 1953 he got only Rs. 1,116, that is, Rs. 6 less, while the earnings of the factories were less in 1952 than in 1953. With the increase in profits in the year 1953 the worker's share has not increased. That is what I mean to say. Now if you come to the index of real earning of the worker, that has come down to 99.9. So, Sir, the industrialists has not paid more to the worker; the industrialist has not added to the fixed capital

The industrialist has only earned the money, has earned extra profits. Wherefrom these profits have come? These profits have come from the people, from this country. On an earlier occasion, Sir, you may perhaps remember, that there was a cry for giving facilities for export. Now the facilities were given, and when the export was allowed, when the export was encouraged, the textile industry did export a lot of textile goods. Later on, when in the internal market they could raise the price and they could get more money and easy money they stopped exports and today we find ourselves in this precarious position that export to the extent of a hundred million yards has fallen and to that extent the foreign exchange of our country is suffering. That means, the textile industry in our country is posing a very serious problem where the Government is neither in a position to control the price nor help the consumer, nor is the Government in a position to control the textile trade and divert the textiles to the export market, nor is the Government in a position to control the entire textile industry. This is the serious problem that the Government is facing with the textile industry in our country. And excise duty is not surely going to help them in solving this particular problem. This excise duty is not going to help the consumer because the consumer will now have to pay a price including this excise duty, and it is not going to help in mopping up the extra profits. The excess profits are something which this duty will certainly not touch. Unless it is excess profits tax or capital gains tax these excess profits of the industry are not going to be touched by your excise duty, and these profits of course are very heavy. I can give you figures and let us for the time being leave our Indian textile magnates; let us take the foreign textile interests in our country, what they have earned as profits during the years 1947-1953. Buckingham and Carnatic earned during this period as profits Rs. 141 lakhs; Madura Mills—Rs. 325 lakhs; Bangalore Woollens—Rs. 125 lakhs; Mettur Industries—Rs. 128 lakhs and British India Corporation—Rs. 356 lakhs. Now here is a question for the Government, and if the Government really wants to control the textile industry in a way that the Government gets its foreign exchange, in a way that the Government helps the consumer, in a way that the textile industry does not get the profits as at present, then in that

case measures will have to be found whereunder the Government can have a foothold in the textile industry itself, and either as a partner in the textile industry or having its own sector in the textile industry it will be able to control the whole operation. May I cite also, Sir, the present Labour Minister, Shri Khandubhai Desai, what he had suggested in 1950? Shri Khandubhai Desai had suggested in 1950 that it 'is' already high time that the textile industry in this country should be natioalised, because "they have earned more than what they have invested". This is what he said then, Sir. But surely he may now turn round and say: "I was idealistic in those days; now I am practical."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR): You have only two minutes.

DR. R. B. GOUR: I am finishing in a couple of minutes, Sir.

He may say so to-day, but then may I suggest very humbly that at least let them take over the foreign sector in this textile industry? Then they will have an economic basis to control the textile industry. Then they will have a say in the trade and will have a say in the price structure of the textiles.

Sir, such are the problems that are facing the Government and the country in relation to textiles, and surely the methods that they are suggesting—and the measures are being supported too by some Members—on "Principles of Economics." What is this economics, Sir? Here is the simple economics. It is this, The textile industry is an elephant industry and the textile magnates are elephant magnates; they have to be controlled and harnessed. That is the problem.

That is the problem and surely the Excise Duty Bill is not going to solve it.

Secondly, the hon. Mr. Bisht said that this excise duty is to give us money for building our country. But the hon. Finance Minister says that money is only a bye-product here and that he is bringing this mainly as a measure of social justice, to control the prices and to mop up the profits. For that you have got the Excess Profit Tax; you have the Capital Gains Tax. If you want money for the development

of the country, then money should be found and there are other measures that have to be taken for that purpose. On that score and on that basis this Bill cannot be supported and should not be supported. With these words, Sir, I would oppose this Bill. I know that the hon. Finance Minister is not going to consider our opposition and I also know that those members of the Congress who are conscientiously opposed to this Bill will surely raise their voice in support of this Bill because of the whip, but I am sure that the hon. Minister will see that the country is opposed to this Bill, that the consumers are opposed to this Bill, that the traders are opposed to this Bill. And finally the purpose for which he wants to have this Bill is also not going to be fulfilled. With these words, Sir, I oppose the Bill.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I regret that it is not possible for me to lend my unqualified support to this measure. While I take no serious objection to the imposition of and enhancement of duty on fine and superfine cloth, I take strong objection to the enhancement of duty on coarse and medium quality cloth. The object of the Bill, as we know, is to mop up the profits which have been made or are likely to be made by the millowners because of the greater demand and shortfall in supply. But we have got to see whether the measure before us is likely to achieve the purpose for which the Bill is being enacted. So far as I am able to see, I am very doubtful if it will achieve the object which it has in view.

Sir, this excise duty is an indirect taxation and we know it for a fact that indirect taxation is always passed on to the consumer and rarely, if ever it hits the person on whom the duty is intended to be imposed. Therefore it is clear that the duty which is being imposed now will not be realised from the profits of the millowners but it will ultimately be realised out of the enhanced price which the consumers will have to pay for the cloth that they will purchase. The question therefore arises whether our people are in a position to bear the additional burden which is being imposed upon them. I do not deny that the common man has not benefited or that his lot has not improved in the last few years. Unlike many others, I am definitely of the view that the common man's income

[Pandit S. S. N. Tankha.]

has risen because of the measures and developments which have been undertaken during the first Five Year Plan and I have no doubt also that the income of the common man will continue to rise hereafter and will rise during the Second Five Year Plan period.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

And this is not only true of the common man in the city as some people are inclined to think, but it is also true of the common man in the villages. His earning capacity has also risen and he is now undoubtedly in a better position than he was several years before. But sir, at the same time we know, and we must not forget it, that our people are still half-fed and half-clad in spite of all their increased earnings, and that their standard of living is still at a very very low level. If then by his increased income the common man desires to raise his standard of living—and that is one of the main objects we have also in view both under the First Five Year Plan and the Second Five Year Plan—why should we not give him the opportunity to raise his standard of living? Raising of the standard of living, I understand, implies both that he should be provided with better food, or in other words that he should be given an opportunity to eat better quality of food to which he has not so far been accustomed and also that if he has remained unclothed or ill-clad all these years then he should be enabled to have some more clothes on him. Therefore Sir, if there is any chance of the common man improving his condition because of his greater earning capacity, is it right on our part to enact measures which will take away that power from him?

SHRI J. S. BISHT: The price is going to rise whether you do it or not.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: The only effect which I am afraid this Bill will have will be that it will deprive the common man of the cloth that he requires because the price of cloth will go up so much that it will become prohibitive for him and he will be unable to purchase the cloth he needs. It is true that the effect of this will be that the demand for cloth in the country will go down and as a result of which the prices may fall. But even then Sir, a measure which deprives the common man of his necessity of life is one which I cannot support.

Now Sir, I have always been of the view that it is always preferable to impose direct taxes on the people rather than indirect taxes, because by imposing direct taxes you know who are the persons you are going to hit. Whereas by imposing indirect taxation you may hit such persons for whom you have the greatest sympathy and whom you do not wish to hit but all the same those persons are hit and they suffer.

Sir, I am aware of the fact that the Taxation Enquiry Commission in its Report has stated that the method of taxation should be wide and deep—I think these are the words, perhaps, which have been used in the report by which I understand that they imply that taxation should be more indirect than direct, but I am sorry that I cannot subscribe to that view. I am, however, gratified to find that Prof. Kaldor who recently visited India and was particularly deputed by the Government to go into this question of taxation in our country has reported against this method of indirect taxation as far as possible. I would, with your permission Sir, like to read a few lines from his Report. On page 4 he says:

"Any residual financial need could be met by excise duties on a limited number of commodities of man's consumption. This last should be regarded as the marginal source of taxation to be resorted to only when and to the extent that the total yield from direct tax falls short of the requirements."

According to this it is clear that indirect tax should be resorted to only when we are unable to get the money, which we want, by direct taxation.

And I venture to say Sir, that we have not yet reached a limit where it is not possible further to tax directly and, therefore, we are compelled to resort to indirect taxation. Therefore, what I would suggest is that the Government must find ways and means to bring down the prices of cloth, not by the imposition of this duty, but by other means.

Now, Sir, the means which I suggest for bringing down the prices is to compel the retail shops of the mills in all cities to sell cloth at the ex-mill rates calculated on the basis fixed by the Tariff Commission plus the duty and octroi and cartage. This method

will provide cloth at a prescribed lower rate to the public and it will also act as a deterrent for the other shopkeepers to sell at a rate higher than that at which the cloth is procurable at these mill retail shops. (*Time bell rings.*) It is not necessary that Government itself should open its own retail shops for this purpose. There was a time some years back when the mills had such depots from which they were selling cloth at reasonable prescribed rates.....

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Even now the mills have depots. Delhi Cloth Mills have depots here.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: The second method which I want to suggest is that some sort of price control should be re-imposed on all varieties of cloth. Now, if it is necessary that along with this price control there should be control on cloth also to the public, I have no objection to its imposition and I would be prepared for it, if it is found that it will act to the benefit of the public. Now, Sir.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: Just one point.

There is one other aspect of the matter which is very regrettable and vital and with which we are very keenly concerned and that is that our exports of cloth are going down, because of the cloth finding a ready market here in India. We must certainly find ways and means to encourage our external trade, because if that is not done, there will be great difficulty for us in future in the fulfilment of our Five Year Plan.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, that will do.

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA: With these few remarks Sir, I give my qualified support to this measure.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must express my gratitude for the somewhat lenient treatment that I have received at the hands of the hon. Members of this House. About nineteen hon. Members have spoken and all of them—more than half, in fact, a larger percentage than half—have given their qualified

support to this measure. Even amongst the other 45 per cent, which did not support this measure, I think they have been very reasonable, excepting for a few cases, which is only to be expected. So far as the measure itself is concerned, I do not think the criticisms that fell from the hon. Members make it necessary for me to explain the scope of this measure. If some hon. Members say, "Well, you will not be able to stop increase in price", well, I have told them that if there is no stoppage of increase in price, then I am afraid we will have to increase our rates of excise duty also.

And then, they said we are taking away from the consumer his purchasing capacity. In one sense it is undoubtedly a measure which is intended to restrict consumption for the time being—at any rate, until such time as I can provide some more cloth for the people. So, basically on the question of providing more cloth for the people, I am completely at one with the hon. Members who pleaded for it. I think we have to provide for that. I mean, there is no question of disputing the fact that we want to raise the standard of living and cloth happens to be one of the indicators for that purpose. And, therefore, the overall objective of providing more cloth, better food, amenities, housing, these are all cardinal points in the total Plan that we have before us of raising the standard of living of the common man. I should plan these. As I said yesterday and as the hon. Prime Minister said, it is not that we have ahead of us one sea where the water is always calm. It happens that the storms are more, relatively to the periods when there is calm and we are now just amidst one of those storms. I do hope that it will be a storm only, that is, the character of this present rise in prices will be temporary, in which case we can revert to normalcy or near it as much as possible. But if, on the other hand, the storm becomes violent, well, we have to use all our methods of control. I am afraid I will have to ask the navigator to leave the place and take over the piloting of the ship. And then all that my hon. friend, Mr. Tankha, said will follow. Undoubtedly price control will follow. I am not going to start control and see that the price is rocketing. At least let us control the price at the mill end. I will tell the hon. Members that we have removed all price control in 1953, but we are still

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

maintaining the technique of control alive. There is production control. Every time I meet the Millowners' Association, they say there is no price control. Everything is free. Why do you keep the price control? The price control is there because I know some time or other I might have to impose price control. It is quite easy. The man that operates price control today for me is a single man. So, the order will be issued, because we can calculate it, even though Mr. Parikh might say that my methods of calculation are all wrong. But anyway it happens that I happen to be the man who calculates it and he will have to accept the wrong methods and wrong figures. And therefore, I would like to say that I am not quite so helpless as I look. In fact, I do not want to re-impose controls at this stage of the Plan. It may be necessary for us, as I have said yesterday, to tighten our belt, say, up to 1958. Well, that will only be for a couple of years. I do not want unnecessary rigour in the economy at the present moment; but if people will have it, well I am prepared to give it.

I do not think my hon. friend Mr. Parikh is quite correct in saying that merely because I have left the Commerce and Industry Ministry, the Millowners in Bombay or Ahmedabad or Sholapur or somewhere else might think that the devil has gone. The devil is still alive. And if my hon. friend is correct in saying that some millowners have gathered together and want to apply trade union methods, I would like to tell them that the trade union methods, are only allowed for the people who are relatively low down in the scale of standard of living. But if people who are getting better incomes want to become a closed shop, well, the arm of the Government is long enough and—I do not know—may be somebody else other than me, might be cleverer, somebody else might be ruthless. I can tell my hon. friends either here or outside that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari is not dead. He is alive and it does not matter if he goes from one portfolio to another, because while the overall responsibility for maintaining some check in prices undoubtedly falls on the Economic Affairs Department, it might be shared by other people. But still it is there. If it is a question of any deliberate flouting of Government wishes, it does

not matter. As I said, the Government is supreme and I happen now, unfortunately or fortunately, to be in a position either to become almost not merely a '*Vanaprastha*' but a complete '*Sanyasi*'. You, have no friends. I can have no enemies. And we will deal with that situation when it arises; but I hope it will not be necessary. Because you use the weapon, the final weapon, like the '*Brahmastra*.' You can use it only once and if you fail after that, you have failed. So, I won't use it until the end; but it can be used.

Sir, I might say my hon. friend, Mr. B. K. P. Sinha—though he is not here—was kind though critical. As usual, my very respected friend, Dr. Kunzru, brought to bear on this question the full force of his intellect. I cannot disagree with him at all because I am one of those who always admit that we are at fault. I can fool the public and this House for some time; I can fool a small section of the people for all time; but I cannot fool all the people all the time. And I know that it is not a question of being virtuous—it is making a virtue of necessity, if you call it. And, therefore, I accept the criticism when it comes from an hon. friend like Dr. Kunzru. The one point that he made was, what is the part that I am assigning in this increase in prices to the rise in the price of coal? Firstly, the price of coal rose only on the 26th June; the date fixed for the rise was 26th June. That is the day on which the increased wages were given according to the Award.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: It has not been given.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Anyway, Government have accepted an immediate rise in the price of coal. I am only concerned about its consequences at the moment. There has been a 20 per cent increase in the price of coal. What happens really is—I have got a table worked out—a 20 per cent. increase in the price of coal means an increase of .28 per cent. in the cost of cloth, not even 1 per cent, but a little more than a quarter of 1 per cent in the price of cloth. That would mean only more than half a pie. I do not think, if they had raised the cost by a pie, I would have meddled with it at all. If they had raised it by quarter of an anna, I would not mind. If they had raised it by one anna, still I would

not mind it. It is not that, but they have raised it a lot more than that. This price is being shouldered by the consumer because of the shortage of cloth. That is the logical consequence. If there is no shortage, they cannot go on raising the price. That is so far as coal is concerned.

Some hon. Member raised the question "what is this wonderful *per capita* consumption of 16·8 yards? What was it in 1939?" I think the statement that I have given or rather submitted to the hon. Members which gives the cloth consumption over a period of years says right on the top "availability of cloth"; it does not say "production of cloth". In the year 1939 we imported 647,264,384 yards. Our purchasing power was higher. And then we had West Punjab where the *per capita* consumption is much higher—probably because of our Sikh friends who use the turban or because of the rather lavish clothes that the Punjabis and the Pathans wear, that adds up to it. Therefore, a comparison of 1939 and today will not bear scrutiny. We were importing nearly 650 million yards at that time. We can import today, and if I have a favourable balance of payments position, well, I can use that money; I won't mind that, I can import cloth. I can approach Japan I can stop exports. Stopping exports of 700 million yards will do the trick. I can say "no exports at all tomorrow." That would add another 700 million yards. I don't have to raise this duty at all. If I say tomorrow "no exports of cloth", they know that prices will crash, and you will find people insisting on forward contracts being observed. But they have sold at high rates so far as the forward contracts are concerned. I would like to say in answer to the hon. Member Dr. Kunzru, as I said at the outset, that we shall endeavour to see that we are not caught so badly in the future as we have been in the past. But I would also like to tell my hon. friends that it is not our intention by any variation of our policy to give up this protection of the decentralised sector. I have said, Sir, even before that I would very much like the weaving as far as possible to be confined to the decentralised sector, and the incidental protection that this measure gives to the handloom industry is, from the point of view of the handloom industry, one which I think is welcome.

Mr. Mazumdar has spoken about leakage. King Charles's head comes up every time. "It will hit the lower income groups. Stocks have disappeared from godowns. Oh! What a magician he is! He raises his wand and stocks disappear." Well, I am not such a magician, nor has he the psychic sight that he claims he has. Of course he does not believe in bourgeois economics. He does not know economics. It does not matter what economics it is. It is all the same.

Mr. Dasappa said that it is like the curate's egg—good in parts. At the same time he would like to see that the power loom sector is not affected. My hon. friend Prof. Kabir was helpful. According to him, a device of this nature is a short term measure; no, it is a short term remedy, he would not call it a short term measure. Long term remedy, as I have said, is different. The question of restriction of consumption is a different thing. As I mentioned, I would not restrict consumption in this particular category—but if prices are going to rise and we cannot supply the demand, the obvious thing is to restrict consumption.

The abracadabra of my friend Shri Mahanty is a thing which is all the more difficult for me to understand.

AN HON. MEMBER : What is that ?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: It means nothing. Mr. Mahanty has apparently got black glasses—temporarily I hope—I am not sure if he will be able to walk out without any help, and he sees everything being black. "Why not price control? Why not go the whole hog?" If I impose price control, probably he will be the first to say "what a foolish thing! The Government never get wise. They did it in the past and they failed."

Shrimati Nigam spoke in beautiful Hindi which I cannot understand. If I could piece together her words, she wanted to have the cake and eat it too.

Mr. Parikh whom we know to be the present-day expert has taken the role of an expert. Of course, being an expert, he must say that I am an expert in dealing with this matter, and he has opportunities of verifying the prices of 289 mills. Well, they have been good people, and I am the person to paint them in the blackest colour and to say that they are making more

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

profit than what they give out. In fact, Sir, I don't say that these figures are infallible. In fact, in the matter of statistics—all apologies to my friend, the Chief Statistician in India, Dr. Mahalanobis—these have appeared from wholesale prices and, may be, that either the tools which he used for the purpose of gathering the information were not quite accurate or the wholesale prices were lower than what they were shown to be. But anyway, Sir, I have told you the magic by which we calculate. May be, Mr. Parikh might produce a different figure, and we produce our own figure, and let us look at it and see what happens.

Mr. Parikh has given useful information about the Bombay Millowners' Association having become a trade union. Well, I will ask my colleague, the Labour Minister, to deal with them.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Is he the Chairman of that trade union?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: There is one thing which Mr. Mazumdar should know and that is that my criticisms are always impersonal.

DR. R. B. GOUR: What Mr. Parikh said was that the Millowners Association had circularised the various units that they should not bear this extra duty.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: He did. I am verifying that information. They know it because they are friends of mine. They know that, if I am alive, I will probably remind them of our friendship.

Mr. Parikh gave us certain figures in regard to shifts. I must say that I must certainly bow down to his superior knowledge, because he has handled a textile mill and the only opportunity that I ever had to do so I declined, very foolishly I have no doubt, it might have given me a better job than what I have. But the position today is that the difference between the first and the second shift is negligible, and Mr. Parikh himself knows that that element of difference is negligible. The difference between the second and the third shift has been stepped up over a period of years. It happens that an increase has taken place to a very small extent, perhaps because of the

opportunities of making higher profits than would be made on the second shift. They must make some profit in the third shift. The cost of production in the third shift, if Mr. Parikh would not contradict me, is slightly higher.

He also said something about the new units working the third shift. For instance, in Coimbatore, where the bulk of the existing mills are new, they are working 23½ hours a day. Now, the fact also remains that in regard to the existing spindlage, the obsolescence is not negligible. We had a survey made of 160 or 170 mills and got some of these figures tabulated. Even the preliminary tabulation reveals a very high rate of obsolescence, and this obsolescence would not permit of working a third shift. Therefore, I am not quite sure that with the existing performance we will be able to increase the third shift working, but every new mill that comes in will certainly work the first, second and third shifts.

He mentioned the number of licences granted and said that no action had been taken when licences were being sold. Well, as an hon. Member of Parliament and a friend of mine, I expect him to tell me where such breaches of the law are taking place, because I will cancel the licences. But I can tell him also that today the pending licences for installation is somewhere near 1.6 million or probably a little less. Out of this, 876,000 have taken effective steps for installation. When I said that I was expecting an increase in the spindlage and therefore in the yarn production between now and the fall of next year, I was banking on these 876,000 spindles working by that time. And the balance, quite a number, we have asked to give us a bank guarantee that they will implement the licence. If they do not give a bank guarantee, subject to the legal powers that we possess, we propose to cancel those licences. Either they should take very effective steps between now and the period when this demand for bank guarantees will expire, or they should give us a bank guarantee. So, Mr. Parikh would find that great minds think alike. He wanted the imposition of one per cent. on the advances to these mills. Somebody in my Ministry has also thought of this idea of asking for a bank guarantee, and he will appreciate that we have not been idle in this

matter. Anyway, I will discuss this matter further with him, and naturally if there is any useful suggestion from him, we will adopt it.

My friend, the judge.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Ex-judge.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI:did not understand what I said. Having been on the Bench, probably he does not appreciate lawyers' arguments. He probably thinks that I am a lawyer; in one sense I am.

Mr. Muhammad Ismail is full of doubts about what I said on the subject. I have said all that I can say, but I cannot clear his doubts. It is good to see that my friend, Mr. Deokinandan Narayan, gave his support to me, even for an extra-textile reason. Mr. Govinda Reddy gave qualified support. He thought that the figure of 16·8 yards *per capita* was an inflated figure I did not inflate it. That is the figure I have. If he does not agree with the figure and if he thinks that cloth consumption is going to be lower, well, the prices will fall down and I will reduce the duty. Mr. Sinha must oppose because he is in the opposition. Dr. Seeta Parmanand wanted to know whether the Planning Ministry was consulted. The Planning Minister happens to be a colleague of mine in the Cabinet and naturally we can do nothing without the approval of the Cabinet, in spite of the fact that some people aver that things are being done without any Cabinet consultation. I am grateful to Prof. Ranga for his support. So also I am grateful to Prof. Kishen Chand. We have become friends now. I think that with the Commerce and Industry Minister he did not agree, but with the Finance Minister he agrees. In fact it is good support which he gave me, and I am grateful to him. So also I am grateful to Mr. Bisht for his support. I am also grateful to Dr. R. B. Gour opposite for saying that this is to mop up the extra purchasing power. Well, that is the intention for a limited period among the other intentions that we have. Mr. Tankha was unfortunately not happy. I am sorry, but I am afraid there is no other way of getting over it.

Lastly I would like to say that I myself am not happy in imposing a duty, a portion of which will inevitably fall—at any rate it is expected to fall—on the lower income groups.

5—30 R. S./56.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Will the hon. Minister first provide some purchasing power in the hands of the poor people and then mop it up?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Well, how to do it without raising inflation, we do not know. It is easier to limit the purchasing power in the hands of the richer classes or the poorer classes as the case may be, but it is a little difficult to provide that purchasing power without facing the danger that naturally arises. I think that, when supplies are short, the whole idea is that even as it is, the extra purchasing power that has been released, which is certainly not even, produces a harmful effect. The net result of it is that, as I said before, this is one of the measures that we can possibly bring forward for achieving in part the objectives that we have in mind, but that is not all. The whole question of prosperity has got to be looked at from a composite point of view. Many things have to be done; may be some extreme measures will have to be taken, if things go out of hand, but it does not mean that we should take only extreme measures. This is all the purpose of bringing forward this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, as passed by the Lok Sabha be taken into consideration."

The House divided.

Ayes	..	50
Noes	..	6

Ayes—50

Agarwal, Shri B. P.

Ahmad Hussain, Kazi

Anis Kidwai, Shrimati.

Bisht, Shri J. S.

Chandravati Lakhanpal, Shrimati

Dasappa, Shri H. C.

Deogirikar, Shri T. R.

Deokinandan Narayan, Shri

Deshmukh, Shri R. M.

Doogar Shri R. S.

Dube, Dr. R. P.

Dutta, Shri Trilochan

Himatsingka, Shri P. D.

Jalali, Aga S. M.

Kabir, Prof. Hymayun

Khan, Shri Akbar Ali

Khan, Shri Barkatullah
 Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
 Kulkarni, Shri G. R.
 Lall, Shri Kailash Bihari
 Latif, Shri Abdul
 Lilavati Munshi, Shrimati
 Mahesh Saran, Shri
 Maya Devi Chettry, Shrimati
 Mazhar Imam, Syed
 Mitra, Dr. P. C.
 Mohamad Umair, Shah
 Mukerjee, Shri B. K.
 Nallamuthu Ramamurti, Shrimati T.
 Parikh, Shri C. P.
 Rajagopalan, Shri G.
 Raju, Shri A. S.
 Ranga, Prof. G.
 Reddy, Shri K. G.
 Reddy, Shri M. Govinda
 Rukmani Bai, Shrimati
 Sahai, Shri Ram
 Saksena, Shri H. P.
 Shah, Shri M. C.
 Shakoor, Moulana Abdul
 Shetty, Shri B. P. Basappa
 Singh, Sardar Budh
 Singh Babu Gopinath
 Singh, Sardar Swaran
 Singh, Shri Vijay
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Surendra Ram, Shri V. M.

Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Valiulla, Shri M.
 Varma, Shri C. L.

Noes—6

Dhage, Shri V. K.
 Gour, Dr. R. B.
 Mahanty, Shri S.
 Mazumdar, Shri S. N.
 Prasad, Rao Shri V.
 Sekhar, Shri N. C.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

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

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday.

The House then adjourned at fourteen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 10th September 1956.