

investigate into this and let us know the result in view of the fact that the Central Government is now being asked to undertake relief operations?

SHRI GOVIND BALLABH PANT: Sir, essentially this is a State subject. We, however, are naturally interested in affording relief and in saving people from the devastation and loss that has resulted from these floods. Obviously, the standing crops have been affected and Orissa will probably be deficit in the matter of food grains so far as the existing standing crops are concerned which have been, as I just said, badly damaged. With regard to other matters we, as I have already said, are anxious to render whatever help we can. We appreciate the difficulties of the Orissa Government and also the promptness with which they have taken all possible measures to meet the distress. Whatever more can be done will be done. I hope this would satisfy the hon. Member.

†RESOLUTION RE RESTRICTION
ON PRODUCTION OF CLOTH BY
MILLS.—continued

MR. CHAIRMAN: The other day Resolution was moved by Mr. Kishen Chand. The Resolution moved is:

"This House, having taken into consideration the recommendations of the Textile Enquiry Committee, is of opinion that production of cloth by mills should be limited to 5,000 million yards per year and that after the year 1955-56 all additional production should be by the hand-loom sector."

This Resolution is before the House.

There is another Resolution which is also tabled for discussion today and I hope you will be able to deal with both these Resolutions at least before the day is over.

†Continued from 2nd September 1955.

श्री द्विकीनन्दन (मुम्बई) : सभापति महोदय, सदन के सामने जो प्रस्ताव हैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यह बहुत सीधासादा प्रस्ताव है। टैक्सटाइल इन्क्वायरी कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में जो सिफारिश की है उसको हम यहां मंजूर कर रहे हैं और सरकार से प्रार्थना करते हैं कि सरकार भी इस सिफारिश को मंजूर कर ले। ५,००० मिलियन गज कपड़ा की पैदायश के बाद जो हमारी जरूरतें रहेंगी वे हैंडलूम से, यानी करघे से, पूरी की जायें। अंदाज यह लगाया जाता है कि १९६० में हमें ५,२०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा की जरूरत होगी। आज की आदमी १५ गज कपड़ा मिलता है और कोशिश यह की जा रही है कि १९६०-६१ में, यानी द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना के आखिर में, हर एक आदमी को १५ गज कपड़ा मिलने लग जाय। इस हिसाब से देखा जाय तो हमें हमारा खुद उपयोग के लिए ७,२०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा की आवश्यकता होगी और एक्सपोर्ट के लिये १,००० मिलियन गज। हमारे देश की पॉपुलेशन करीब ३६ करोड़ है और आज के हिसाब से ४५ लाख हर साल आबादी बढ़ती है। इस तरह १९६० तक हम ४० करोड़ तक बढ़ जायेंगे और हर एक आदमी को १५ गज के हिसाब से ७,२०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा लगेगा।

इस प्रस्ताव में यह कहा गया है कि पांच हजार मिलियन गज कपड़ा मिलों से पैदा किया जाय। अब रहा ३,२०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा, वह हैंडलूम से पैदा किया जाय। आज हैंडलूम से करीब १,४०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा पैदा होता है और १,८०० मिलियन गज अधिक पैदा करने की इसमें गुंजायश सूचित की गई है। टैक्सटाइल इन्क्वायरी कमेटी का हिसाब इस प्रकार है कि पांच हजार मिलियन गज मिलों से पैदा हो और १,४०० मिलियन गज सेमी पावर लूम से पैदा हो, २०० मिलियन गज पावर लूम से पैदा हो और १,६०० मिलियन गज हैंडलूम से पैदा हो। यह १,६०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा ६ लाख हैंडलूमों से पैदा हो सकता है। ऐसा टैक्सटाइल इन्क्वायरी कमेटी का कहना है। उनके हिसाब से आज वीकिंग लूम की जो

[श्री द्विवेदीनन्दन]

सख्या बतलाई गई है वह १२ लाख हैं, हालाँकि मर हिसाब से यह सख्या बहुत कम है। अगर उनके ही हिसाब ले लिया जाय तब भी १२ लाख में से ६ लाख वर्किंग लूम्स १,६०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा पैदा करंगे और जो तीन लाख रह गये उनको संमी पावर लूम में बदलने की सिफारिश है। मेरे इस पावर लूम की बहस में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि यह एक दूसरा सवाल हो जाता है। परन्तु मुझे यह कहना है कि जो इन्क्वायरी कमेटी कायम हुई थी वह खासकर इसलिए कायम हुई थी कि आज हैन्डलूम उद्योग पर जो मुसीबत आई है उनमें काम करने वालों को आज धन्धा नहीं मिल रहा है वे बेकार हो रहे हैं, उस बेकारी को दूर करने के लिए और उसके उपाय बतलाने के लिए यह इन्क्वायरी कमेटी नियुक्त की गई थी। किन्तु इन्क्वायरी कमेटी की सिफारिशों को देखने से यह पता चलता है कि बेकारी कम होने के बजाय अधिक बढ़ने वाली है।

मेरा जो सुझाव है वह यह है कि हैन्डलूम को हमें हर प्रकार से उत्तेजन देना चाहिये ताकि यह उद्योग बढे और देश में बेकारी कम हो। यह बात हम कर सकते हैं ऐसा मेरा कहना है। मेरा कहना यह है कि पाच हजार मिलियन गज तो मिलो से कपड़ा पैदा होता है और हमें २२०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा देश के लिए और एक हजार मिलियन गज कपड़ा बाहर एक्सपोर्ट के लिए कुल ३२०० मिलियन गज पैदा करने की जरूरत रह जाती है। इसका अर्थ यह हुआ कि ३२०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा पैदा करने के लिए तजवीज करना है। इस इन्क्वायरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट से यह भी मालूम होता है कि इसके लिये सूत की बहुत कमी होगी। उसकी निगाह में तो हैन्डलूम को पावर लूम में बदला जा सकता है किन्तु मेरी निगाह में हैन्डलूमों की तादाद बढ सकती है और बढाई जानी चाहिये। परन्तु जो जरूरत रह जाती है आवश्यकता रह जाती है वह यार्न यानी सूत की है। आज हालत यह है कि मिलों से हैन्डलूमों को सूत मिलता है। यदि

३२०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा हैन्डलूम को तैयार करना होगा तो उसके लिए मेरे हिसाब से या इन्क्वायरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के हिसाब से ७६२ मिलियन पाउंड यार्न की जरूरत होगी। इस ७६२ मिलियन पाउंड सूत में से ३५० मिलियन पाउंड सूत हमें आज मिलों से मिलता है। यानी अगर हमें ३२०० मिलियन गज कपड़ा के लिए सूत की आवश्यकता है तो हमें ४१२ मिलियन पाउंड अधिक सूत की आवश्यकता होगी। अब इतने सूत को हम कैसे पैदा कर सकते हैं यह हमारे सामने सब से बड़ा सवाल है। इस टक्सटाइल कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में दो बातें साफ कह दी गयी हैं। पहली बात यह है कि मिल में पाच हजार मिलियन गज से ज्यादा कपड़ा पैदा न किया जाय। दूसरी जो आश्चर्य की बात है वह यह है कि हैन्डलूम की सख्या अब आगे न बढ़ायी जाय और फिर यह जो अधिक कपड़ा पैदा करना होगा इसके लिये जो ४१२ मिलियन पाउंड सूत की आवश्यकता है उसके लिये सूत की नई मिलें खोल कर पूर्ति की जाय। यदि सूत की मिलें खोली जाती हैं तो उनके लिये करीब ३६ करोड़ रुपये के कैपिटल की पहली आवश्यकता है और करीब २२ करोड़ रुपया उसके करंट एक्सपेंडीचर के लिये आवश्यक है यानी इन नई सूत मिलों के लिये ५८ करोड़ रुपया जब आप इवेंट करंगे तब आपको कहीं ४१२ मिलियन पाउंड सूत मिल सकेगा। मेरा सुझाव यह है कि इससे कोई बेकारी कम होने वाली नहीं है क्योंकि दो चार हजार मजदूरों को ये सूत की मिलें शुरू करके आप काम दे सकेंगे बहुत हुआ तो पचीस हजार को काम दे सकेंगे लेकिन हमको काम देना है लाखों लोगों को। इस लिये अखिल भारतीय खादी बोर्ड का यह सुझाव है कि यह जो अधिक सूत की आवश्यकता है उसकी पूर्ति अम्बर चखें की माफत होनी चाहिये। अम्बर चखें का हिसाब लगा करके अखिल भारतीय खादी बोर्ड ने यह दिखलाया है कि यदि १७ लाख अम्बर चखें शुरू किये जाय तो ये ४१२ मिलियन पाउंड सूत की पूर्ति हो सकती है और १७ लाख अम्बर चखें चलाने के लिये उन्हें शुरू करने के लिये १५ करोड़ रुपये से अधिक पूँजी की आवश्यकता

नहीं हैं यानी एक चौथाई या एक तिहाई पूँजी से आप उतना सूत पैदा कर सकते हैं जितना कि आप सूत की मिलें खोले तो उनसे पैदा कर सकेंगे। तो यह पूँजी का सब से बड़ी बचत तो होती ही है, इससे जबरदस्त फायदा जो होगा वह यह है कि १७ लाख अम्बर चर्खा चलाने से आप ३४ लाख आदिमियों को काम दे सकेंगे, ३४ लाख बेकारों को काम दे सकेंगे और अम्बर चर्खों पर हर एक को कम से कम रोजाना एक रुपया मजदूरी मिल सकेगी।

श्री अकबर अली खान (हैदराबाद) अवैलेबिल हैं ?

श्री वंबकीनन्वन . अवैलेबिल हैं। वह इस पर एक रुपये से ज्यादा भी पैदा कर सकता है क्योंकि इसकी उत्पात्ति का जो हिसाब लगाया गया है वह यह है कि अम्बर चर्खों के ऊपर एक दिन में आठ घंटे में कम से कम १६ गुड़ी (हैंक्स) पैदा हो सकती हैं। आज के हिसाब से तो करीब दो रुपया रोजाना मजदूरी मिल सकती है। परन्तु जब पैदाइश अधिक होगी तब अम्बर चर्खों की वजह से खेदी अधिक पैदा होने के कारण कुछ खादी को सस्ता करना होगा, इस लिये उन्होंने यह हिसाब लगाया है कि कम से कम एक रुपया मजदूरी अम्बर चर्खा के ऊपर रोजाना हम दे सकेंगे ही क्योंकि वे दो हैंक्स जो हर घंटे में पैदा होगी ये कम से कम हैं। इस से ज्यादा तीन साढ़ें तीन गुड़ी (हैंक्स) तक एक घंटे में पैदा हो सकती हैं। और अगर वह इतना पैदा कर सका तो उसको कम से कम दो रुपया मजदूरी मिल जायगी। इस प्रकार ३४ लाख आदिमियों को कम से कम एक एक रुपया रोजाना पैदा कराने की शक्ति इस अम्बर चर्खों में हाते हुये और अम्बर चर्खों के मार्फत ४१२ मिलियन पौंड सूत की पूर्ति कर सकते हुये भी मैं यह नहीं समझता कि इस की क्या आवश्यकता रहती है कि इस देश में सूत को मिले और आगे खोली जाय।

आखिर इस प्रश्न के अन्तर्गत जो सबसे बड़ा सवाल है यह है कि हम अधिक सूत किस तरह से पैदा कर सकते हैं क्या हम मिलें बढ़ावे

अधिक पूँजी उनमें लगावे और कम मजदूरों को काम दे, या अम्बर चर्खों के मार्फत हम ३४ लाख मजदूरों को काम दे और कम पूँजी में काम दें। इस प्रकार जो सूत पैदा होगा उसको बुनने के लिये करीब १२ लाख कर्घे लगेंगे। हिसाब यह है कि हर एक कर्घे पर डेढ़ आदमी को काम करना होता है यानी १८ लाख आदमी वह होंगे। तो ३४ लाख और १८ लाख यानी ५० लाख आदिमियों को आप १७ लाख अम्बर चर्खा चला कर काम दे सकते हैं। इस हिसाब से आप इस प्रश्न की ओर देखिये कि इसमें कितनी बड़ी ताकत हिन्दुस्तान की बेकारी कम करने की है।

हमें ३२ सौ मिलियन गज कपड़ा पैदा करना है। हम यह नहीं कहते कि आज का एक भी कर्घा बन्द हो हम यह नहीं कहते कि आज का एक भी पावर लूम बन्द हो। १ लाख या १२ लाख जितने भी हैंड लूम आप बतलाते हैं वे भी चलते रहे और उन पर १५ सौ मिलियन गज कपड़ा पैदा होता रहे। परन्तु १५ सौ मिलियन गज कपड़ा जो बाकी रहा वह अम्बर चर्खों के सूत से ही पैदा किया जाय ताकि १७ लाख अम्बर चर्खें चल सकें और करीब ५० लाख आदिमियों को मजदूरी मिल सकें। तो मेरी आपसे यह नमूतापूर्वक प्रार्थना है कि आप इसको साँचियें और देखिये कि कहा तक यह ठीक है।

अम्बर चर्खों के बारे में यह पूछा जाता है कि क्या यह कामयाब हो सकता है ? मैं आपसे नमूतापूर्वक यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह कामयाब हो चुका है। यदि मेरी मालूमात ठीक है तो सरकार की ओर से कहिये या आल इंडिया खादी बोर्ड की ओर से कहिये करीब चार हजार अम्बर चर्खों का आर्डर तो दिया जा चुका है और शायद आने वाली जनवरी तक ये चार हजार चर्खें शुरू हो जायेंगे और कई केंद्रों में एक प्रयांग के तौर पर, एक्सपेरिमेंट के तौर पर, आज ये चर्खें सौ सौ की तादाद में शुरू किये गये हैं।

अम्बर चर्खा के सूत के बारे में शायद आपके दिल में कुछ शक हो। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि पुराने चर्खों से कई गुना अच्छा सूत

[श्री द्विकीनन्दन]

अम्बर चर्खे पर निकलता है यानी अम्बर चर्खे के सूत की टेंसाइलस्ट्रेंथ करीब ७० से १०० तक पहुँच गई है। अम्बर चर्खे का सूत करीब करीब मिल के सूत जैसा होता है, एक सा होता है। यह भी अन्दाजा किया गया है कि हैंडलूम पर आज हाथ के चर्खे के सूत से जितना कपड़ा बुना जा सकता है उससे करीब दूगना कपड़ा अम्बर चर्खे के सूत से हैंडलूम पर बुना जा सकेगा। ऐसा आज प्रत्यक्ष एक्सपेरिमेंट किया जा चुका है और एक्सपेरिमेंट्स अभी चल रहे हैं। तो मेरी आपसे यह प्रार्थना है कि जिस वक्त हम कहते हैं कि पाँच हजार मिलियन यार्ड्स से ऊपर मिल कपड़ा न बनायें और अगर इससे ज्यादा मिलों को कपड़ा निकालना ही हो तो वह एक्सपोर्ट के लिये भले ही निकालें लेकिन यहां के लिये कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है।

श्री २० प्र० सक्सेना (उत्तर प्रदेश) : यह तो प्रस्ताव में नहीं है।

श्री द्विकीनन्दन : बात यह है कि १ हजार मिलियन गज एक्सपोर्ट में चला जाएगा और जो ७२ सौ मिलियन यार्ड्स देश में रहेगा, वह हमारी जरूरत को पूरा करेगा, क्योंकि कर्माटी की रिपोर्ट में यह है कि १९६० तक एक हजार मिलियन गज कपड़ा बाहर जा सकेगा जब कि आज ६ सौ मिलियन गज कपड़ा बाहर जाता है। इस हिसाब से अगर एक हजार मिलियन गज से ज्यादा आप बाहर भेजना चाहें तो आप मिलों में अधिक कपड़ा पैदा कर लीजिये। यह बात मैंने कही थी, अब आप की समझ में आ गया होगा।

तो मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि आप इस तरह से इस प्रश्न को देखिये कि मिलों को नुकसान न हो, पावर लूम को नुकसान न हो, जो आज कहीं चल रहे हैं उनको भी नुकसान न हो, और ५० लाख आदिमियों को अम्बर चर्खों की माफत उद्योग मिल जाय और हमारे देश से बेकारी कुछ दूर हो। जो बहुत से हमारे देशवासी भाई हैं, देशवासी बहन हैं जो घर से बाहर जा नहीं सकतीं, वे भी घर में अम्बर चर्खा चला कर एक

रुपया रोज पैदा कर सकती हैं और अपनी प्रतिष्ठा को बढ़ा सकती हैं। इस लिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि आप इस प्रस्ताव को मंजूर करें।

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated): Sir, I consider this Resolution as of special importance in the setting of the Second Plan. It, to my mind, raises a number of controversial questions and we have to make up our mind one way or the other. When we accept the Resolution, our mind should be clear as to what we are about. I personally feel that this question of village industries, though you may call them cottage industries, has not only an important place, but a permanent place in our economy. But I will not press that point. At the present stage many of us are not convinced about it but I think we are all convinced that it has an important place in the Second Five Year Plan.

The Second Five Year Plan has gone one step further. Year before last, the Commerce and Industry Minister, Mr. Krishnamachari, used to talk in a different tone which appeared to be a little harsh. He said, "I agree that village industries require help since they are in distress but how long can you give it? Well, give them help, but how long?" That was the tone. The tone today is very much changed; it is very much better. Nobody denies that it has an important place in the Second Plan. Now what the Finance Minister says is very heartening. He says, "If you satisfy some conditions, go ahead. You want more money, have it. Have as much money as you want. But the conditions are: produce adequate consumer goods so that there is no deficiency." This is one of his conditions. Then he says, "Give me sufficient quantity of employment which is also measurable—so many lakhs—and do not draw on foreign exchange." He knows very well that the last will be a trifle. We will have nothing from foreign countries and will not encroach upon foreign exchange. These are the tests and these are important tests.

Now, considering these tests and taking up the Textile Enquiry Committee's Report before us, you will find that the Committee has no satisfactory answer. If it had, I would accept it. It is not a satisfactory answer, in the sense that it will not give the employment which we want and which the Finance Minister expects. It will give us perhaps enough supply of cloth, maybe even at a cheaper rate. It is very easy to say, "Have more money; add a few more looms, have ~~more~~ ^{move} spindles and give adequate yarn to the handlooms but go on."

There is a lurking suspicion that this handloom is an absurd thing; so convert it into a semi-automatic loom at a particular rate within six years or so. Now, I have not seen a semi-automatic loom and I asked a member of that Committee—I hope the Chairman has seen it—I have seen power looms but not semi-automatic looms. Convert them into semi-automatic looms at the rate of 20,000 handlooms, per year, the production being 20-22 yards a day and so on. Then slowly wind up and liquidate all the handlooms. Surely that is a challenge. Of course, it does not require hundreds of crores of rupees; it requires 35 crores of rupees for new spindleage and 14 crores of rupees for conversion, a measurable and a reasonable thing. But he says, "Do not have more handlooms; reduce their number; convert them into semi-automatic looms so that the production becomes faster and faster and we would have enough cloth." He is very kind when he says that he will freeze the mill production at 5,000 million yards. But it creates a great apprehension in my mind. Of course, mill production will be 5,000 million yards and no more. That is a kind of assurance and I accept the assurance. But in a whisper he says another 200 million yards, please don't touch them. 5,000 million yards for the mills and 200 million yards for the power looms; now we do not mind it at all. But what causes anxiety is converting one into another.

He reduces the number of handlooms but supports the small spinning centres costing about 35 crores of rupees or so, spread out all over the country. Then somewhere I have a fear. I don't want to read out books, but Gandhiji said somewhere that the movement the spinning mills are spread out in the country, the destruction of handlooms and the *charkha* is certain. Of course, he says that in his own fashion which is more effective than mine but he is very definite about it. The moment that happens, the destruction of the handloom is certain, and so of khadi. Things are different now; we have changed. The Finance Minister is talking in a different language and even Mr. Krishnamachari is talking in a different language.

Now coming to what the Textile Enquiry Committee says, I personally would resist if I could, this scattering of spinning mills like the rice husking mills. I have seen in Tamilnad, and I was astonished to see the rate at which hand-pounding is going away there. If I could, I would resist it in every way, because this, to my mind, means the destruction of the handloom, the poor, helpless dependents of the handloom. They do not get the yarn they want. They have to get it through half a dozen middlemen who grab 30, 40 or even 50 per cent. Then, when the price of cloth goes up, the yarn is not available, but when the price of cloth goes down, it is available. They get it when they do not want it. They do not get it when they want it. They are entirely dependent upon the spinning mill. Considering the importance of the next Plan, I would resist it. The private sector may have its own way, the public sector may grow in its way, but the social sector, the community sector, the village sector must grow more and more, from decade to decade. I am of that opinion. But we do not think of it and instead are merging it into the private sector. It is wrong to forget that it is the social sector, the *panchayat* sector, the community sector, which will grow from

[Prof. N. R. Malkani,]

decade to decade until it over-shadows all other sectors. So I would not tolerate this dispersal. This is a poisonous thing. This is a dangerous thing. If I am helpless at least I would say, "Please let the weavers have a cooperative spinning mill where the handloom cloth is properly produced but in no case should it be owned by the private sector." It should not have that stranglehold, that grab upon the social sector. If that is not possible, do the second best thing. Let the public sector own the spinning mills where the weavers can get cheaper yarn. That is a suggestion if the worst comes to the worst. Let the spinning mills be owned by Government as they are owning a lot of other things. But, Sir, even supposing, as the Textile Enquiry Committee says, that we will get enough cloth because there will be enough of yarn, enough of weavers and enough of capital to convert handlooms into automatic looms, the employment problem is not solved. It becomes more insoluble. Even according to them, when they convert looms into semi-automatic looms, so many people are thrown out of employment and there is no alternative employment.

Then, Sir, their calculation of 1.25 persons per loom is wrong. We have another calculation made by the village Industries Board. They say that it is an underestimate; it should be more than that. It is a very strange thing, one official committee cutting another official committee. I do not know who is right. I think the latter is right.

THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIES (SHRI N. KANUNGO): Which figures?

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: I am talking of the Village Industries Board Report published a few days ago. According to you there are about fifteen lakh workers engaged in the weaving trade. Twelve lakh active looms engage fifteen lakh workers. The Village Industries Board says it is completely incorrect, substantially wrong. They think that there are

today looms engaging weavers of the order of twenty-five lakhs. Some say it is even twenty-eight lakhs. Now mill owners think it is a disastrous thing, a foolish thing, this coming into existence of large numbers of handlooms. It should be checked. But shouting will not shut them up, and thank God, they have not the power to shut them up, and thank God, our own Government will see to it that they are not shut up in this manner. But there are 25 lakhs to 28 lakhs of looms—you can have your own calculations—working 6 hours a day, producing five to six yards per day, say, 200 yards in a month. But you have to give them the yarn. If you give them the yarn, they will work 8 hours a day, 10 hours a day and even 12 hours a day, and will work for 320 days or even 365 or 366 days in a year. But give them the yarn. They are not idle because they do not want to work; they are idle not because they do not want to be active, but because you compel them to be lazy and useless. And when they have prepared their cloth, then it is cloth which the Government itself won't buy. And then it is said that they are lazy looms and they should be shut up or they should be converted. Sir, is that a question which we can honestly put to these looms or to these weavers? It is, to my mind, a very unfair challenge to the looms, because the looms are there to work, and the village industries people say that given the work, these 25 lakhs—if they produce even 6 yards a day and work for 300 days in a year—can give you 4,500 to 5,000 million yards, as much as the mills can give you.

They are today being worked to the extent of one-third of their capacity. If you give them work at least to the extent of two-thirds of their capacity, if not to the extent of their full capacity, they can do that very easily. And, Sir, I do not wish to foist on you figures of employment. It is so obvious that by converting them you throw thousands out of employment, and you do not give any additional

employment at all And thank God, today, there is another alternative, and a very important alternative, and according to which, I would rather amend the Resolution and say that it should be (*Time bell rings.*) Sir, the Resolution was going to be tabled by me, and not by Shri Kishen Chand It was my Resolution

MR CHAIRMAN: Maybe, but still you are speaking later

PROF N R MALKANI: A little concession, Sir, because it is my Resolution

SHRI R U AGNIBHOJ (*Madhya Pradesh*): Mr. Kishen Chand is not here Therefore, Prof. Malkani can reply

MR CHAIRMAN: That is what you suggest But I do not accept the suggestion.

PROF. N. R MALKANI Sir, I will take a few minutes, and I will not encroach upon the time of my hon. friends.

Sir, now fortunately, an alternative has come, by good luck, not because of Government, not because of the private sector, but because of the efforts, for years together, of small, uneducated, or half-educated, people without any encouragement, working in their humble way And they have now made the discovery of *Amber Charkha* It has surprised me always, Sir,—and you are a learned man, and you know it better—why there has been no change and improvement with regard to spinning All other things have changed and improved, but not the handloom, for the last 5,000 years I do not know why. The carding machine has changed and improved the loom has changed and improved, the ginning machine has changed and improved but the spinning machine has refused to change during the last 5,000 years or so, except during the last few years. Why? It is a miracle that has happened in India A challenge was given to the technicians of the world. And *Amber Charkha* is a miracle in technical improvement And now the miracle

has happened, let us accept that miracle which has come after 5,000 years of trial and waiting, because that shows us a way out. And I am convinced that gives the confidence and the faith, and by converting the whole thing into *khadi*, not merely into handloom, but into *khadi*, and by spreading the 17½ lakhs of *charkhas* all over, we can achieve the target, and we can fulfil the conditions which were given to us by the Finance Minister The whole question is this. The challenge is to us, and to the Government, to start that organisation, that wide-spread organisation, that efficient organisation, which will reach the villages and give training there to thousands and lakhs of people, lakhs of spinners and lakhs of weavers And I have got the figures here. If you produce 1,500 million yards, additional 55 lakhs can be employed; 55 lakhs of weavers, carders, dyers, carpenters and all sorts of people can be employed 55 lakhs of them can be employed if you produce only 1,500 million yards But if you produce more than that, then many more can be employed, and the Finance Minister will be surprised to find that there is such a vast scope for employment. But the challenge is to the Government, the challenge is to us, the challenge is to the Congress, of starting that organisation with faith And if there is faith, it will percolate and seep downwards But if we ourselves are faithless, that organisation will not come And then, Sir, I know, you will at once turn upon me and say "Oh, Malkani, you talked so loudly and you shouted so much, but nothing has come about" But then, I would simply say that it would have worked, if we had the faith, if we had the confidence, and if we had put up the organisation with confidence The challenge is there Let us take up that challenge, and then we will find that this will have not only an important place, but also a permanent place in the national economy of India.

SHRI H C DASAPPA (*Mysore*): Sir, I think I owe it to myself that I

[Sari H. C. Dasappa.]
should speak on this Resolution for the reason that I was a Member of the Kanungo Textile Enquiry Committee, and I have subscribed my signature to the recommendations of that Committee.

PROF. G. RANGA (Andhra): What a tragedy!

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My friend says 'tragedy'. Well, I do not very much think that it is going to be a tragedy at all. I am afraid, Sir, it requires a lot of hard and clear thinking in order to appreciate the stand that the Committee has taken. I may at once say.....

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Do not make it very hard.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA:.... that it did necessitate a lot of heart-searching among the Members themselves. They were not all at one with me. There were no predilections, no prejudices, no attachments—and nothing of the kind—among the Members of the Textile Enquiry Committee. It looked to me, Sir, that when the Government constituted the Committee, they did not want on the Committee anybody who had any affiliation or attachment to any one of the sectors there, i.e. the mills, the composite mills, where they have the spindleage as well as the loomage, the power loom sector, which was not very much noticed at any time prior to it, but all the same, was serving the society in its own way, and, of course, the handloom sector. The khadi production was, of course, there, but we were not charged mainly with the task of khadi production, which is a very highly specialised thing. And therefore, Sir, I feel that nobody in this House or anywhere else can ascribe to that Committee any kind of a predisposition, any kind of a bias towards any one sector. They did proceed with their task in a thoroughly objective manner. And if these recommendations have been made in the manner they have come out in the report, I may at once say that

they were the result of a realistic approach to the problem. It is not as though they were laying down a policy for the future economy of the land. It is not as though they were asked to think of this sector—the textiles—*de novo*, and lay down a policy in conformity with the various objectives which the Government themselves had in view. I may say that the Avadi Resolution came later on. It was not there at the time of the constitution of the Committee.

Having made these few preliminary remarks, I must say what led the Committee to the conclusions which they have arrived at. These handloom weavers are not spread over the whole State in all villages. This is a very important matter which I think this House should take note of. They are distributed in various pockets. It is certainly not a village industry. Most of these weavers are concentrated in pockets in urban areas as well as in rural areas. These two sectors, both the handloom and the power loom, are mostly run by a certain community which for centuries has followed this profession. It is not done by amateurs or people of other avocations stepping into this profession.

PROF. G. RANGA: Certainly it is not true of Maharashtra. It may be true of Mysore.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My friend Mr. Ranga, may see this volume—appendices.

PROF. G. RANGA: Have I not read it? That is why I came to that conclusion that you committed a tragedy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can answer him later.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I had better answer Prof. Ranga who seems to be a protagonist of no-change policy. It is said in this report:

"99 per cent. of the factory owners in this State were originally independent handloom weavers."

That is in a particular place and.....

PROF. G. RANGA: What is that place? I mentioned Maharashtra.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: My hon. friend can get the reference here. Even in Maharashtra it is mainly run by men who belong to the weaver community.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI D. NARAYAN: Not necessarily, there are others also.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: By and large . .

PROF. G. RANGA: That is the Committee speaking.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: It is the Committee's findings I am referring to and I would refer my friend, Shri D. Narayan, to pages 1261 onwards. He will find that they are largely men of weaver community.

SHRI D. NARAYAN: There are many other communities also....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I do not say that there are no others but I am only telling you the findings that we have come to because of the data that was supplied to us. For instance here in the census of power looms in India at page 1262 it says:

"In other words 88·7 per cent. of the power looms are privately owned by people who were originally independent handloom weavers"

There are certain bigger units of power looms. My friend, Shri D. Narayan, is perfectly correct; he refers to the bigger units but I referred to the large number of smaller units which are probably about 85 to 90 per cent. of the power loom units. There he will find that they are owned mostly by the weaving community. I am referring to the fact that wherever the handloom weavers were found, if they could get power, they had changed over to power looms. This is a tendency which I am afraid my friends, Prof. Malkani and Shri D. Narayan, have not taken note of. It is not that any

one went and tried to induce them to take to power looms. The natural evolution of a handloom man

SHRI D. NARAYAN: You want to increase it.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: When he gets power, he switches over to power looms for the simple reason that he can earn a few more farthings than what he could with handlooms.

PROF. G. RANGA: It is a suicidal tendency.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I am afraid they are forgetting the simple fact that I am for handlooms and we have been thinking of resuscitating the handloom and that is why we said: "Handlooms have a chance of survival just as *charkha* spinning has a chance of survival if *Amber Charkhas* are employed." I ask Mr. Narayan and Prof. Malkani whether hand-spinning has a chance if there is no *Amber Charkha*.

Now Mr. Malkani and Mr. D. Narayan want an improvement of *charkha* spinning by a different complicated process, namely of *Amber Charkha* and they don't want a similar improvement in handloom.

(Interruptions.)

My friend is putting a very babyish question. We have discussed 'his question but what is it that they have said? They have said 'a semi-automatic loom' which means not the introduction of power though that also forms a separate recommendation but an improvement over the handloom so that the weaver, as Mr. Chintaman Deshmukh said, instead of being condemned to a perpetually low standard of living—to a margin of a rupee a day which comes to Rs. 24 a month—can have something more—say Rs. 70 a month. Is that a crime that we have committed to see that a person is enabled to earn an income of Rs. 70 or 72 where he was earning only Rs. 24?

AN HON. MEMBER: At whose cost?

SHRI D. NARAYAN: May I read?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish. You have had your say.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: We were here faced with a certain position. Sir, you will remember that even in Bangalore City, in Cubbonpet, there were handlooms. In Doddaballapur town in Bangalore District there were handlooms and because power was available, without anybody's external or special encouragement, they switched over to power looms and when they found that cotton was not paying them, some of them switched over to silk and art silk. They have now switched over to art silk because it pays them better. We cannot say that they must only weave cotton. Therefore what I say is: Here is a thing which we have got to take note of and not merely proceed on hypothetical or ideological grounds. If it is a matter of policy, certainly we shall change over. My first complaint is that this Kanungo Enquiry Committee Report has not been treated fairly by the Government. I lay this charge at the door of the Government because, while the Press Commission Report which came out about the same time has received such a large amount of consideration at the hands of the Government, I say there is not the same treatment accorded to this Committee. What the Government should have done was to have placed this report for consideration before the two Houses of Parliament, taken their opinion and come to decisions. For the present what they have done is that they have simply shelved it virtually. Only my friends Prof. Malkani and Shri Kishen Chand have brought up a discussion on what I say is a fraction of the recommendation. I am not here anxious that every recommendation should be accepted. I am the last person to say that. I would be happy if Parliament takes up this report for consideration and comes to any decision. So I feel this report has not had a fair deal. Before I conclude...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time to conclude, only two more minutes.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: I will finish soon, Sir. I will not take more time. I only want to add that I am glad and also grateful to my hon. friends Shri D. Narayan and Prof. Malkani for the slight, if I may say so, orientation they gave to this Resolution when they referred to the fact that the power looms are already producing 200 million yards. They have not the slightest objection to their continuing to produce this 200 million yards. That is an extremely reasonable view and I only hope that the Government will take up the same reasonable attitude. But what is it that the Government have done now? Instead of allowing this small sector to pursue its profession peacefully, they have levied a prohibitive excise duty of Rs. 20 per loom, per month, per shift. This is an intolerable burden on the poor decentralised power looms.

In conclusion I submit that it is difficult for me to accept this Resolution as it is, because of the simple reason that the power loom sector has not been taken due note of in this Resolution. I would also say that this is a subject that requires far deeper consideration from all points of view if we are to arrive at a fair decision and as it is, I am afraid we have taken it up only as a piecemeal affair.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is indeed a good thing that this Resolution has been brought forward in this House and we are able to discuss the production of the weaving section of the mill industry. It is well-known that with their present capacity, the installed mills can produce 5,000 million yards or rather 5,400 million yards and that capacity will remain, provided there is no change to 3 shifts or 4 shifts in the working of the present looms. Secondly we have to remember that the coarser the cloth woven, the greater will be the yardage. The

present figure of 5,100 million has been achieved on account of the fact that the number of picks is lower. By lowering the number of picks the yardage can be increased by 25 per cent or more. Therefore, there is a possibility of increasing the yardage by reducing the number of picks and that should not be forgotten in the present circumstances.

What I would submit now is, the Government should make up its mind as to what should be the maximum yardage to be produced by the present textile industry in their looms, be they ordinary or automatic.

It has also to be understood that we require about 15 yards *per capita* at present, and every year with the improvement in the standard of living of our people, we shall require a yard more *per capita*. So the total requirement will be 300 million yards more every year for the subsequent five years of the Plan. So the total requirement of the country will be increased to the extent of 1,500 million yards. Therefore the Second Five Year Plan has put the target of production of both mill and handloom at 8,200 million yards, leaving 1,000 million yards of the produce of the textile industry for export. For the internal consumption, therefore, at the end of the 5 year period there will be 4,000 million yards of the textile industry production or rather the production of the mill industry. And there will be 3,000 million yards of the handloom industry. Now it is advocated that this production of the mill industry should be sealed at this level and the Planning Commission I think have made some tentative recommendation in this respect. Although I am in the mill industry, I would say that I am entirely in support of sealing the production of the mill industry. I say this because we have to look not only to the mill industry, but also to the needs of the country at large. We have to see whether we are able to provide full employment in our country. That is the first necessity or the first requi-

site in any Plan that we have to make. There has been tremendous progress in the agricultural and industrial fields, but all that progress will be nullified if adequate employment is not found for everyone who desires to work for eight hours in our country. I think the present democratic Government should be wedded to that principle, that everyone should be given work for eight hours and he should get between 12 as 6 Rs 2 according to his ability. That must be the criterion of a better government or a Welfare State at the present time. Unless and until we achieve that, unless and until we devise measures by which there is adequate employment in the country, there should not be any craze for mechanisation in our country. We may adopt various technological improvements, but that should also coincide with our capacity to give employment to the unemployed and the under-employed who are there in the country. That factor has to be borne in mind. Why is the Communist doctrine prevailing in some parts of the country, in spite of the great progress that the country is making? Communist doctrines prevail in the country because the common man thinks that he is not being treated in the way he should be in a democracy. That is the reason why Communism is spreading in some parts or in some undeveloped parts of the country, especially in Orissa, Bihar, Travancore-Cochin and other parts. Why is there this cry?

SHRI S PANIGRAHI (Orissa): There is no Communist domination in Orissa.

SHRI C P PARIKH: May be, but there are certain other parts of the country where some parties are trying to influence public opinion that way and that opinion may get excited to such a degree that the discontent and resentment that will arise from that would be difficult to be controlled by any government. If they are kept under control it is only because of the superior leadership in this country because there are no other leaders in this country to match them in per-

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

sonality, wisdom and guidance. That is the reason why Communism is not spreading. But we must not be oblivious to facts that exist in the country. We require employment for 18 lakh persons who come up every year, over and above the present persons who are unemployed in the country. Therefore, although mechanisation may reduce the cost of production by about 15 per cent., even then it has to be avoided, particularly if we can produce by handlooms cloth to the extent that we require. In that case we put a limit on the mill production.

In this connection we must not lose sight of the fact that we want to maintain our exports, and exports can only be promoted if there is competition in the cost of production. I am quite aware of this fact. But the mill production can very well cater the needs of our export trade and at present, in the international markets, our mill production, the production of our textile industry is able to compete even with Japan, and much more so with the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom.

SHRI GOPIKRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Bharat): What about the power loom production?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I am coming to that. First of all we must concentrate on the fact that our exports are on no account lost. For that our present mill production is adequate. Even modern machinery embodying the technological improvements made in other countries is being installed in our country and so the cost of production is going down in the mills. Therefore many of our mills are well-equipped and have up-to-date machinery and so they can compete in the international markets. As regards the excise or sales-tax that we are levying on the mill production, ranging from 15 to 30 per cent., that they is not borne by the export trade. The export trade does not bear either the excise duty or the sales-tax. Therefore, their capacity to compete in the international trade does not suffer on this count.

Next I come to the point: whether this additional production of 3,000 million yards can be achieved by the present handlooms or whether power looms should be installed in place of the handlooms. I see that even the Village Industries Board have said that the use of electricity should be allowed in the cottages, especially where there is no hired labour. Therefore, if an individual wants to have a power loom in his own home, where he does not employ hired labour, but his own family labour is employed, in that case, the power loom should be allowed. We have to do that because if we want to encourage cottage industries we should see that we do not put a bar which it will be administratively impossible to impose, and we cannot prevent the use of electricity in the cottages.

So long as they are installed for family work and there is no hired labour, power looms should be allowed.

PROF. G. RANGA: Is it for their own consumption or for that of some other people? Will you put other people out of employment?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Whether it is for their own consumption or for others has been discussed very broadly and the Village Industries Board and others have come to the unanimous conclusion that electricity should be permitted so long as there is no hired labour. In other cases, it will be very difficult to differentiate and administer the scheme. In the case of consumption less than $\frac{1}{2}$ horse power it will be difficult to control. Effective control can only be enforced when consumption is more than 2 horse power. In the other cases it is not practicable on administrative grounds. But that does not mean that power looms should be encouraged or that weaving should be done more by these means. That way ten or twenty looms will be installed which will take away the twenty lakhs of handlooms working in the country. Mr. Dasappa says that these people will

get more wages; of course, the wages of these people will go up from one to three but it would be at the cost of the starving people. This factor has been forgotten and the members of the Textile Enquiry Committee have also lost sight of this fact. In the case of mechanisation, the increase in the ratio of wages is 1 to 10; when you are giving 10, 15 or 20 per cent. more of wages, you are taking away the wages of nine men. That factor should not be forgotten.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Is it not a very good argument for doing away with these old obsolete mills instead of propping them up with additional finances and props?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I am one with the hon. Member in regard to the re-conditioning and renovation of these mills. I would go a step further and say that compulsion should be used in such cases but that does not mean that mill products should be preferred. There is agitation in the country at present. The installation of further automatic looms has been banned. Let us see the comparative figures of production. In the case of handlooms, a worker working for eight hours produces 8 yards. In the case of mills one man produces 80 or 90 yards in eight hours whereas in the case of automatic looms it is 1300 to 2000 yards by one man. Do you want cheaper cost of production or do you want discontentment and unemployment in the country? These are the only two problems. Unless and until you solve the problem of unemployment, this question of mechanisation will have to be discarded in the larger interests of social justice.

There is another matter which has been lost sight of by the Textile Enquiry Committee. There is a cry in the country at present for production of yarn by the *Amber Charkha* instead of by the spinning mills. The cost of production per lb. of yarn by the spinning mills is about five to six annas whereas in the case of the

Amber Charkha it comes to about Rs. 2 per lb.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Are you talking about yarn?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Yes.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Then it is Rs. 1/15 per lb.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: It is Rs. 2 or Rs. 1/15 according to the quality of the yarn.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: It is 20 count.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: I am not disputing that but the point is this. There is a great cry in the country that the production of spinning mills also should be restricted, there should be no further installation of spindles. The Karve Committee has been appointed to go into that matter. Proposals will be brought forward after the report of this Committee is received. I am not in favour of the spinning section being centralised in the cottages by *Amber Charkha* because the people will not be able to cope up with the demand. This may not also give them adequate remuneration. This is a demand in the country which should be taken into consideration.

The Kanungo Committee has recommended progressive conversion into power looms at the rate of 5,000 looms every year. This is to be done in a period of twenty years. There will be temporary unemployment which the Committee does not mind. This phenomenon is a very rare and a material one. If it is allowed in any industry, the other industries also may adopt mechanisation as their policy thus creating a greater amount of temporary unemployment. When there is acute unemployment in this country, it is not desirable to encourage temporary unemployment. Government should take steps to put this ceiling on the looms by preventing the installation of further looms as also automatic looms. If any man wants

[Shri C. P. Parikh.]

to instal automatic looms, then cloth produced by such looms should bear a heavy excise duty. Such cloth may also be allowed to compete in the external markets. Only under that condition should power looms be allowed to be installed. The man is bound to export that cloth but if he does not export it but sells in the domestic market, he must bear a correspondingly higher duty for the profit which he makes.

Government should take into consideration this matter.

श्री ज० रा० कपूर (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव का पूर्ण रूप से समर्थन करता हूँ। सब से पहले मैं अपने माननीय मित्र मलकानी साहब को धन्यवाद देता हूँ जिन्होंने कि प्रयत्न से यह प्रस्ताव आज हम लोगों के सम्मुख उपस्थित हुआ है। मैं अपने माननीय मित्र दासप्या साहब से भी सहमति प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ कि यह अति उत्तम होता यदि सरकार द्वारा टेक्सटाइल इन्क्वायरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट इस सदन में विचारार्थ प्रस्तुत की जाती। खैर, जो हुआ सो हुआ। यह बड़ा हर्ष का विषय है हम सब लोगों के लिये, विशेषकर उन लोगों के लिये जो कि महात्मा गांधी के अनुयायी हैं—कि आज से करीब ३५ वर्ष पूर्व जिस बात को महात्मा गांधी ने कहा था और जिसकी लोग हंसी और खिल्ली उड़ाया करते थे—विशेषकर विशेषज्ञ—उसी को आज सब करीब करीब एकमत से कह रहे हैं कि यदि देश का कल्याण चाहना है, यदि देश में जो बेरोजगारी फैली हुई है उसको दूर करना है, तो हमें घरेलू उद्योग धंधों को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये और मुख्यतः खादी को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिये। इस तरह से आज हम देखते हैं कि महात्मा गांधी कितने दूरदर्शी थे। जिस तरह से उनकी इस बात को आज हम मान रहे हैं, उससे हम यह सबक लें कि और भी जो बातें उन्होंने कही हैं और जिनको अभी तक बहुत से लोगों ने नहीं माना, यदि जल्दी ही उन बातों को मान लें तो हमारे देश का और जगत का कल्याण बहुत कुछ जल्दी ही हो जाय।

उपसभापति महोदय, जहां तक करघा से कपड़ा बनाने का सम्बन्ध है, उसके दो भाग हैं। एक तो यह कि वह कपड़ा मिल के सूत से बनाया जाय और दूसरा यह कि हाथ के कते सूत से बनाया जाय। इसमें तो कोई दो रायें नहीं हो सकतीं कि कपड़ा हाथ के करघे से ही अधिक से अधिक मात्रा में बनाया जाय। लेकिन जहां तक इस प्रश्न के इन दो भागों का सम्बन्ध है उसमें बाड़ा सा मतभेद है। एक तो जो खादी के प्रेमी हैं वे यह चाहते हैं कि करघे से कपड़ा हाथ के बने सूत से ही भविष्य में बनाया जाय। इसमें भी मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद दो रायें नहीं हैं। सभी लोग चाहेंगे कि यदि सम्भव हो सके कि हमारे पूरे कपड़े की जो आवश्यकता है उसकी पूर्ति केवल हाथ के कते सूत के बने कपड़े से हो जाय तो अति उत्तम हो। लेकिन देखना यह है कि कम से कम निकट भविष्य में क्या सम्भव है। मेरे माननीय मित्र देवकीनन्दन जी ने कुछ आंकड़े दिये। आंकड़े देकर एकदम से वे इस निर्णय पर कूद पड़े कि यह चीज सम्भव है। लेकिन उन्होंने जो आंकड़े दिए हैं उनसे प्रत्यक्ष कोई ऐसी चीज निकट भविष्य में सम्भव नहीं प्रतीत होती। मुझे और जितने भी गान्धी जी के अनुयायी हैं, उनको ३०, ३५ वर्ष से खूबसे विशेष प्रेम और स्नेह है। लेकिन यह होता हुआ भी यदि हम समझते हैं कि उनका यह सभावा कार्यरूप में परिणत नहीं हो सकता निकट भविष्य में, तो हम यह अपना कर्तव्य समझते हैं कि यह बता दें कि केवल इच्छा ही को प्रकट कर देने से काम नहीं बनता। जैसा कि अंगरेजी में एक कहावत है :

“If wishes were, orses beggars would ride”

केवल हमारे हार्दिक इच्छा प्रकट कर देने से ही कि हमारे देश में खादी हो, हमारा काम पूरा हो जाता तब तो हम उसका पूर्ण रूप से समर्थन करते लेकिन हमें यथासम्भव खादी को प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए और यथासम्भव प्रोत्साहन देने के बाद वहीं पर हमें चुप नहीं हो जाना चाहिए और यदि हाथ के करघे का कपड़ा मिल के बने सूत से भी बन कर हमारी यह आवश्यकता पूरी हो सकती है, तो उस

पर हमें कोई विरोध नहीं करना चाहिए बल्कि उसको भी प्रोत्साहन देना चाहिए।

उपसभापति महोदय, इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ सुझाव मैं रखना चाहता हूँ कि किस प्रकार से सरकार काम करे कि इस व्यवसाय को हम तरक्की द सकें। सुझाव देने के पूर्व मैं यह दर्श कर प्रसन्नता प्रकट करता हूँ कि मेरे माननीय मित्र, जो अभी मुझसे पहले बोलें, वे मिलमालिक हों पर भी इस बात को मानते हैं कि मिलों का उत्पादन एक हद तक पहुँचने के बाद उसमें रोक लगा दी जाय। मैं उनको इसके लिए बधाई देता हूँ। यह जो वे कहते हैं, निश्चय ही वे दर्श के हित के लिए तो कहते ही हैं लेकिन एक बुद्धिमान व्यवसायी होने के नाते वे अपने हित में, अपनी मिल इंडस्ट्री के हित में भी कहते हैं क्योंकि यदि दर्श में बेकारी दूर न हुई और लोगों के पास काफी पैसा सामान खरीदने के लिए न हुआ तो मिलों द्वारा चाहे जितना अधिक से अधिक कपड़ा उत्पन्न हो वह यूँ ही मिलों में पड़ा हुआ सड़ता रहेगा, यदि उसके लिए खरीदार नहीं हुआ और खरीददार तभी हो सकते हैं जब लोगों के पास पैसा होगा। पैसा तब उनके पास आयेगा जब कोई उद्योग या धंधा होगा। वह उद्योग और धंधा हैंडलूम उद्योग द्वारा ही उन्हें अधिक मात्रा में मिल सकता है और किसी के द्वारा नहीं। इसलिए जैसा कि मैंने कहा, उनका इस बात का समर्थन करना दर्श के हित में होते हुए इंडस्ट्री के हित में भी उत्तम ही है।

उपसभापति महोदय, प्लानिंग कमीशन की रिपोर्ट के भीतर यह सिफारिश है—सरकार भी मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बात को स्वीकार करने जा रही है—कि हैंडलूम व्यवसाय को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाय। लेकिन एक बात पर विशेष रूप से जोर दिया जाता है और वह यह कि केवल सहयोग समितियों द्वारा जो कपड़ा उत्पादन हो उसको ही सहायता दी जाय। मैं सहयोग समितियों का पूर्ण रूप से समर्थन करता हूँ मेरा खुद भी सर्वन्य एक सहयोग समिति से है। लेकिन

व्यावहारिक रूप से मैं यह दर्शता हूँ कि केवल सहयोग समितियों द्वारा कुल आवश्यक कपड़ा बनाये जाने की जो इच्छा लोगों की है वह पूर्ण नहीं हो सकती। सहयोग समितियाँ हमारे यहाँ आसानी से नहीं बन रही हैं और जो बनी हुई भी हैं उनमें अधिकतर सफलता प्राप्त नहीं हुई। हमें निश्चय ही यह प्रयत्न करना चाहिए कि उनको सफलता मिले और अधिक से अधिक संख्या में वे स्थापित हों और अच्छी तरह से चले लेकिन हमारा मुख्य उद्देश्य तो इस समय यह है कि बेरोजगारी दूर हो और कपड़ा हाथ के करघे द्वारा बने और यदि हम दर्शते हैं कि सहयोग समितियों द्वारा उस उद्देश्य की पूर्ति निकट भविष्य में आसानी से नहीं हो सकती तो हमें दूसरे प्रकार से कपड़ा बनाने के लिए जो करघे चालू किये जा रहे हैं उनको भी पूर्ण रूप से सहायता देनी चाहिए। यह एक मुख्य बात है जिसके ऊपर मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय और सरकार का ध्यान विशेष रूप से आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि हम केवल इस रलागन अथवा नार्स के पीछे न चले कि हमें तो सहयोग समितियों ही द्वारा सब कुछ करना है, लेकिन उसका दूसरा पहलू भी देखें। मेरा सुझाव यह है कि हैंडलूम से कपड़ा बनाने के लिए लिमिटेड कर्पनिन्हा खोली जाय चाहे वे प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कर्पनिन्हा हो, चाहे, पब्लिक लिमिटेड कर्पनिन्हा हो। लेकिन उनके आर्टिकल्स आफ एसोसियेशन में यह बात विशेष रूप से हो अनिवार्य रूप से हो कि उस फैक्टरी में जितने भी काम करने वाले होंगे सब का एक भाग होगा, उस फैक्टरी में हर एक कार्यकर्ता उस फैक्टरी में हिस्सेदार या भागीदार होगा। इससे मैं समझता हूँ कि सहयोग का जो एक सिद्धान्त है उसकी एक अंश तक पूर्ति हो जाती है। मैं मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि वे इस बात के ऊपर विशेष रूप से ध्यान दें कि इन फैक्टरीयों को भी उसी प्रकार से सहायता देनी चाहिए जिस प्रकार कि आप सहयोग समितियों को सहायता देने के लिए तैयार हैं। यह भी वे नियम बना सकते हैं कि उन लिमिटेड कर्पनिन्हा को सहायता न दी जायगी जिनमें काम करने वाले किसी रूप से

[श्री ज० रा० कपूर]

भी भागीदार नहीं हैं। ऐसी फैक्टरियों में सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त किये हुए एक या दो डाइरेक्टर हों और काम करने वालों की ओर से भी बोर्ड आफ डाइरेक्टर्स में एक या दो प्रतिनिधि हों। यदि ये दो शर्तें रख दी जायंगी तो मैं समझता हूँ कि बहुत कुछ विरोध जो इस सुझाव के ऊपर हो सकता है कि सहायक समितियों द्वारा जो फैक्टरियाँ कपड़ा बनायें केवल उनको ही सहायता क्यों देनी चाहिए, वह खत्म हो जायगा। मैं यह भी चाहूँगा कि जिन फैक्टरियों को सहायता दी जाय उनके लिए यह अनिवार्य कर दिया जाय कि वे अपनी फैक्टरी में एक शिक्षण केन्द्र अवश्य स्थापित करें क्योंकि यदि हर एक फैक्टरी में शिक्षण केन्द्र स्थापित नहीं होगा तो आपको नये कपड़े बनाने वाले कारीगर नहीं मिल सकते।

अभी दो तीन रोज़ हुए जब एक प्रश्न यहाँ चल रहा था तो उस समय माननीय करमरकर महोदय से पूछा गया था कि क्या आप यह आवश्यक नहीं समझते कि सहायता देने के पूर्व यह शर्त भी रखी जाय कि फैक्टरियों में शिक्षण केन्द्र भी हो। उत्तर में तो उन्होंने कहा कि बच्चे पैदा होने के बाद स्वतः ही घर में शिक्षा प्राप्त कर लेते हैं। प्रश्नों के समय इस सम्बन्ध में ज्यादा वादीवाद नहीं हो सकता था किन्तु मैं सम्मान पूर्वक कहूँगा कि उनका इस तरह का सोचना एक भ्रम है, ऐसा हर दशा में नहीं होता है। इस तरह से हमारे उद्देश्य की पूर्ति नहीं हो सकती है क्योंकि इस समय देश में कुछ विशेष प्रकार की जातियाँ हैं जो इस काम को करती हैं। हमारे प्रान्त में कोली जाति है जो इस धंधे को करती हैं, उनके बच्चे घर में काम सीख लेते हैं; लेकिन यदि हमें बेरोजगारी को दूर करना है तो यह आवश्यक है कि सब जाति के लोगों को इस धंधे में लगायें और बेरोजगारी की समस्या को हल करें। यह कार्य तब ही हो सकता है जब हम उनके लिये शिक्षण केन्द्र खोलें और उनको शिक्षा प्राप्त करने के लिए हर प्रकार की सुविधाएं दें। अगर हमने इस तरह

के शिक्षण केन्द्र खोलें और सब जाति के लोगों को उसमें इस व्यवसाय की शिक्षा दी तो हम बहुत हद तक देश में बेरोजगारी की समस्या को हल कर सकते हैं।

अब तक यह होता रहा है कि सहायक समितियाँ खोल दी जाती हैं और इनमें वही लोग काम करने को आते हैं जो अब तक इस काम को करते रहे हैं। फल यह होता है कि इन लोगों को विशेष सुविधाएं मिल जाती हैं और नये लोगों को काम सीखने का अवकाश नहीं मिलता। अतः इस तरह की सहायक समितियों से बेरोजगारी की समस्या को हल करने में किंचित् मात्र भी सहायता नहीं मिल सकती है। क्योंकि जब तक नये लोगों को नये काम सिखाकर रोजगार में नहीं लगाया जायेंगा तब तक हम बेरोजगारी की समस्या हल नहीं कर सकते हैं।

मैं एक सुझाव यह भी रखना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार द्वारा हर जिले के हैंडक्वार्टर में एक ऐसा आदमी नियुक्त किया जाय जो इस उद्योग में हर प्रकार की सहायता दे। बहुत से जिलों में इंडस्ट्रियल इंस्पेक्टर हैं लेकिन मेरा अनुभव यह है कि वे इस काम में अधिक सहायक नहीं हो सकते हैं। किन्हीं किन्हीं जगहों का मेरा निजी अनुभव है कि उन लोगों को हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री के बारे में कुछ ज्ञान ही नहीं होता है। उनका नाम इंस्पेक्टर न रखा जाय क्योंकि इंस्पेक्टरों की इतनी भरमार हो गई है कि यह पता लगाना मुश्किल हो जाता है कि कौन किस संस्था का इंस्पेक्टर है। इसके साथ ही साथ इंस्पेक्टर लोग अपने को साहब समझने लगते हैं और अपना अधिक समय दफ्तर में ही व्यतीत करते हैं। अतः हैंडलूम सहायक के नाम पर हर जिले में एक सज्जन की नियुक्ति की जानी चाहिये जिसका मुख्य कर्तव्य इस इंडस्ट्री की ओर ध्यान देना होगा।

मुझे हैंडलूम बनाने वालों की ओर से पता लगा है और सभी को यह मालूम है कि हैंडलूम के कपड़े की मांग विदेशों में बहुत ज्यादा होने

लगी हैं, विशेषकर अमेरिका में हमारा यहां से कपड़ा भारी तादाद में जाने लगा है और उसके क्षम भी बहुत अच्छे मिल रहे हैं। मुझे पता लगा है कि दिल्ली के नजदीक शाहदरा या गाजियाबाद में एक बहुत बड़ी हैन्डलूम फैक्टरी है। मैंने तो देखी नहीं किन्तु मैं समझता हूं कि माननीय मंत्री जी को इस बारे में मालूम होगा और उन्होंने देखी होगी। वहां पर बड़े पैमाने पर हैन्डलूम का कपड़ा तैयार हो रहा है। बहुत मंहगा कपड़ा वहां पर तैयार किया जा रहा है और यह सब अमेरिका भेजा जाता है। २० और २५ रुपये प्रति गज के मूल्य का कपड़ा वहां पर तैयार हो रहा है और सब बाहर के देशों को भेजा जा रहा है। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में यह चाहूंगा कि सरकार द्वारा अनुसंधान का कार्य किया जाय और नये नये डिजाइनों को तैयार करके फैक्टरियों को दिये जाय ताकि वे उस तरह का कपड़ा बना सकें। सरकार को इस बात का भी पता लगाना चाहिये कि हमारा कपड़ा बाहर के किन किन देशों में खप सकता है। अगर हमने इस तरह की कार्यवाही की तो हमारा हैन्डलूम कपड़ा बहुत ज्यादा तादाद में बाहर के देशों में जा सकेंगा और हम अपने देश में अधिक लोगों को रोजगार दे सकेंगे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार की ओर से हैन्डलूम इंडस्ट्री को बढ़ावा देने के लिए डायिंग और पॉलिशिंग प्लांट भी हर जिले में स्थापित करने चाहिये। मेरा अनुभव यह है कि हैन्डलूम इंडस्ट्री को डायिंग और पॉलिशिंग के उपयुक्त साधन उपलब्ध नहीं हैं जिससे उन्हें बड़ी कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ता है और इस उद्योग को धक्का लगता है।

अन्त में मुझे एक ही प्रार्थना करनी है और वह यह है कि हमारे प्लानिंग कमिशन के मेम्बरों और अन्य कर्मचारियों को हैन्डलूम के बारे में अधिक प्रचार करना चाहिये क्योंकि इससे ही हमारे देश का कल्याण हो सकता है। वे लोग इस सुभाव को केवल अन्य लोगों तक ही सीमित न रखें बल्कि अपने जीवन में भी कार्य रूप में परिणत करें। जैसा की रामायण में तुलसीदास

जी ने कहा है "पर उपदेश कुशल बहुतैर"। दूसरों को उपदेश देना आसान है लेकिन अपने ऊपर उसको लागू करना चाहिये। इसीलिए...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time, Mr. Kapoor. That will do. Mr. Pattabiraman.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, my position today is doubly difficult because the Chairman of the Committee has become the Minister-in-charge and another very active member has already anticipated our arguments and answered them and cleared out of the House. In spite of the handicap, it is not my intention to throw mud at the most remarkable document the Committee has been able to produce. The document, has been collected very scientifically and very efficiently and it will be a standing tribute to those who were in charge of the Committee. But while appreciating their labour, their endeavour and their sincerity of purpose, I am not prepared to line up with Mr. Dasappa when he said that it is the Book of Books, that it is the Bible and that whatever it contains must be accepted as the last word. I am not prepared to accept that. Sir, the scope of the terms of reference of the Textile Enquiry Committee, I am afraid, has been completely overlooked by the Committee. Paragraph 3(c) of the terms of reference clearly refers to the utilisation of our resources, both in men and material, in the direction that is socially most desirable. This has been completely overlooked by the Committee. Sir, the basic approach of the Committee itself is entirely wrong. First of all, I would like to ask the members of the Committee and the Government to say what the reason was for their pegging the production of mill cloth at 5,000 million yards. I can understand the basic year; I can understand the normal year, but the abnormal year has been chosen which was not fulfilled even in 1954. In 1954 according to the document which Mr. Dasappa referred to 4,878 million yards was the production of the tex-

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.]

tile mill industry in this country. The Committee wants that it must be fixed at 5,000 million yards. What was the reason for pegging it up at such a high level when even the peak production could not reach up to that? The Committee has given no answer, much less a satisfactory answer for fixing that at that figure. I must submit, with all respect to the Committee and its members, that this has been fixed most arbitrarily. There is neither logic behind it nor the sanction of the people; nor is there any principle involved in it.

Sir, another thing that has been done is that they have put the handloom and the mill industry on a footing of parity. They have taken the status of both to be equal but I am afraid that the Committee has not considered the fact that a century ago in this country the handloom was producing all the cloth that was necessary and was even exporting to outside countries. But in a hundred years there has been this romance of the textile mill industry which has reversed the picture completely and today what do we see? The most flourishing industry of the East, the staple industry of India, has gone to dogs and is now in ruins, and on the ashes of the dead industry a new industry has grown. And to give both of them parity is nothing but a social injustice—I would refrain from using stronger language. I would have congratulated them if their approach had been this way; if they had said that the handloom industry is a weaker industry, a dying industry and therefore it must be given a helping hand. They must have fixed the quota for the handloom industry and the residue must have been given to the mill industry. I would have been glad if they had said that 1,000 million yards would be for the handloom industry and the residue will be for the mill industry. I could have understood the logic then. What I say is that most unfortunately from the very beginning the Committee has been very, very unsympathetic

towards the handloom industry. Sir, I am reminded of a Tamil proverb according to which one ignorant person wanted to describe to another ignorant man who the *Pancha Pandavas* were. He said, "The *Pancha Pandavas* are five brothers like the poles in a charpoy," showed his three fingers, wrote two and then completely wiped it out. Just like that the Textile Enquiry Committee began by paying a glowing tribute to the handloom industry; reduced it from 28 lakhs to 12 lakhs—by mathematical strangulation, I will call it—and further filtered it down to 9 lakhs; they brought it down to 3½ lakhs; and, finally, said 50,000 power looms should survive. And all glory to the handloom industry. Can it be said that the Committee has done justice to the handloom industry? I am not going to question the facts, the methods by which they came to this conclusion that there are only 12 lakhs of looms. Jugglery with figures has been attempted to stifle the industry. I shall not be so uncharitable as to say that the report is partial to the mill industry. But I must say, whatever may be the consequences, that the feeling of the people is that the Committee had no sympathy for the handloom industry and they did not want to help.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: May I say, Sir, that it is not a correct statement?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: Sir, I am not prepared to yield. Mr. Dasappa had the right to say so many things in the Committee, but I am not prepared to accept them.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kanungo will defend you, Mr. Dasappa, don't worry.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Lakhs of non-commercial looms in Assam are excluded.....

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Why are they excluded?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. He is not yielding.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I would like to ask the Committee

whether they think they have made a very good recommendation in para 73 (item No. 66 of the summary of recommendations). It reads as follows:—

“The low income consumer cannot for any length of time go on paying a higher price for a production manufactured on a tool of production which could be made more efficient.”

If cheapness is the main criterion for the Committee, it could have sat for fifteen minutes and said: import all goods from Japan. The Committee need not have sat for so many days and come to the conclusion that the low income consumer could not pay.

Secondly, I would like to ask the Committee whether they took into consideration the fact—if their decision is to be implemented—what the fate will be of the hundreds of thousands of weavers in this country. I am sorry that here in Delhi, the far off capital of India, people do not know much of the miseries of the handloom weaver, how he has been eking out his livelihood. He has been thrown out on the streets and many a weaver has gone out into the streets in spite of the so-called prosperity of the weaver. I was very much pained to hear Mr. Dasappa saying that the man would get about Rs. 20 more; he would be now getting about Rs. 60. Is it a sin, he asked? Perhaps Mr. Dasappa has not read what the Committee says. The Committee says that for every handloom weaver, if a handloom is to be replaced by a power-loom, you will have to replace five handlooms. The average handloom production per day is 6 yards; whereas the semi-automatic power-loom production is 30 yards. Sir, in this country where unemployment is staring us in the face, where people are still in the streets begging and starving, we want to put Rs. 20 in one man's pocket and not to five persons and their families. The Committee has made the observation that the average family of a weaver consists of 3 to 5 persons. Three to five persons

according to you. All right, I am prepared to accept your estimate of 15 lakhs. So, $15 \times 5 = 75$ lakhs people will be on the streets. Is it economics? Is it politics? Is it justice, I would ask, to simply sacrifice these innocent people at the altar of jugglery of mathematics and figures? Is it, Sir, human, I want to ask, I am sorry that the authors of the report were not aware of or were not prepared for the A.I.C.C. Resolution passed recently in Delhi. The A.I.C.C. came and said that the ultimate aim of the Second Five Year Plan was not merely to increase the national income alone but to have full employment. In the light of the direction of the A.I.C.C., which has been accepted by the top leaders of the country and the Government, I think this report in respect of the handloom is worth only a scrap of paper. I am using very strong words. If you are not going to give them employment, what are you going to do with the 15 lakhs of handloom weavers? You are not going to give them employment. Are you going to throw them to the wolves?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five minutes more.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I will finish. Sir, the recommendations of the Committee are very many. The power-looms have been introduced. I do not mind the power-looms; we are not against progress. But today the problem is a human problem. The social aspect of the problem is graver than your politics, economics. Today we talk about politics, economics, statistics. But if you are going to uproot millions of people, about fifteen lakhs according to your estimate—according to my estimate it is 28 lakhs, let us strike a bargain, let it be 20 lakhs—are you going to give them employment? Already they are partially unemployed today. They are not getting even ten days employment in a month. You have seen that there is so much capacity that the handloom weaver could be employed even thirty days a month. If you are not able to give him employment for thirty days,

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.] at least give him employment for three hundred days a year. Twenty lakhs of people can be given employment for 300 days a year and the production of handloom cloth will be about 3,600 million yards. That is the potential capacity. The mill industry has prospered and only one-sixth of those employed in the textile industry is employed there. I will submit that you must at least give the handloom weavers their quota of 3,000 million yards and give the residue to the mills. Otherwise, it will be impossible. The handloom weaver is a silent man. He has suffered in patience. He has suffered in silence; but that does not mean that he will continue like this for long. He thought that an era of hope had come. He thought that the days of suffering were over and the horizon of happiness was there. But the Kanungo Committee has given the greatest shock of his life. I am sure I won't be misunderstood. I request that I should not be misunderstood when I say that there is already a feeling in South India, after Mr. Kanungo has become the Industries Minister, that the Government is bound to implement the recommendations of the Committee and there is already an agitation going on. I wish it would not be true. Today the Madras State Handloom Board has passed a resolution that the mill industry should be given only 4,000 million yards and the residue must be given to the handloom. At least that may be accepted. Take the figures from 1946 to 1955. The mills have increased the production by a thousand million yards just because of the patronage given by Government. I am not going to ask anything, but I would point out that the Government is committed to one thing, to give full employment to all the people. That is the most important factor in the Plan. I would like the hon. Minister to reply to this point as to how he is going to reconcile the A.I.C.C.'s demand and the Government's stand on this matter with the recommendations of the Kanungo Committee in

relation to full employment. I would like to utter a warning also. The handloom weaver problem is not so simple as it looks. It cannot be solved by Committees and mere calculations and mathematical jugglery. It has to be treated as a human problem. The more you ignore the truth, the more difficult the problem will become. I appeal to the hon. Minister not to be swayed by what he has observed earlier, but take into consideration the A.I.C.C. Resolution and the feelings of millions of people who are suffering, who have never had prosperity in their life and who have all along suffered. They should be taken into consideration and they should not be allowed to starve. That will be a dangerous thing. If you are not able to give them enough food, their next alternative will be revolution and violence and no amount of Committee reports and statistics will stop them.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am of the opinion that the last speaker has not rendered any service to the cause that he holds dear. He is best pitted against our friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, who is not here. But to introduce a feeling of animosity and to strike a sort of note that pits the Southerners against the Northerners and so on, is to my mind very distasteful.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: No, no. I am sorry. I did not say that.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am not going to yield.....

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: He has had his say and I must have mine.

There are four means of cloth production. One is the textile mills, the other is the power-loom, the third is the handloom and fourthly, there is khadi. So far as these means of textile production are concerned, I am concerned only, solely and exclusively with the last-mentioned, that is,

khadi. It has been part and parcel of my existence for the last 35 years. Whether dead or alive, I live by khadi and for khadi and other means of production are not of very great importance so far as I am concerned. But I am not the entire.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But here we are concerned only with handlooms.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I am aware of the fact that we are concerned with the handloom industry and I had, for that reason, thought of confining myself to handloom. But then, this khadi has been mentioned and spoken of in this House very frequently, and it is part and parcel and one of the basic means of production.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Resolution is about handlooms. So, if you are to be relevant, you have to speak only about handlooms Mr. Saksena; I want you not to be irrelevant.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I will be the last man to be irrelevant, because I know the difference between being relevant and irrelevant.

Sir, the handloom industry is being helped considerably, both by the Government and the general consumers. The cess that is imposed on the mill-made cloth is intended for the support—the deficiency support—of the handloom weavers. Now, even then, the cry is raised very often that the handloom industry is being killed, is being suffocated and all that. Sir, this is unjust and unfair. So far as unemployment is concerned, it is not confined to the handloom weavers of the South alone. There are handloom weavers all over the country. The South, of course, has most of them; that is admitted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, that is all that he wanted to say.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: And if his speech is scanned and read, it will give quite a different picture. Anyway, Sir, I intend to be very generous to him and agree that that

was all that he wanted to say. But, so far as unemployment is concerned, unemployment of the entire country as a whole has to be removed, not of the handloom weavers only. Now, so far as the Textile Enquiry Committee's report is concerned, it is perhaps under fire. Now, if it is under fire, you can understand the attitude of the Government about the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee, by the fact that its very Chairman has been raised to the status of a Minister. To all intents and purposes, the Government proposes to give effect to the recommendations of that Textile Enquiry Committee. Now, those recommendations are not simply baseless and unfounded. They have got to be read carefully in order that their meaning may be fully understood.

Sir, I do not think that a very strong and unassailable case has been made out on behalf of handloom weavers and no grievance either proved, so far as the support and the assistance that are being given to the handloom weavers are concerned. So, I do not know whether to oppose this Resolution or to support it. As far as my friend, Mr. D. Narayan is concerned, he gave us figures so clear that I was persuaded to believe that we should say goodbye even to these poor handloom weavers and all that, and concentrate on khadi and khadi alone.

You say that the Resolution is about handlooms and handloom weavers are being given proper help by the Government and the people and by all concerned. And I shall not grudge if more assistance, help and encouragement are to be given to them, but not at the cost and sacrifice of worsening the unemployment situation in the country or by sacrificing production in the textile mills even. Even the mills are as necessary for the benefit of the country and for export, as the handloom industry is. If there are many many more people employed in the handloom industry, as they actually are, there are certainly a large number of people employed in the textile mills

[Shri H. P. Saksena.]

also. Their number may be smaller, but then their employment has also got to be continued. I feel that the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee should be studied. With these words, Sir, I close.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): I have to make a request.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are only three minutes more. Janab Muhammad Ismail Saheb.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I may not support the resolution as it stands word for word, for instance, the figure of yardage and the time-limit contained therein. But, however, I support very earnestly and very strongly the central idea of the Resolution and the spirit underlying it. That is that every step should be taken to encourage the handloom industry. The Government, of course, are taking steps to strengthen and to help the handloom industry. It has established a Handloom Board and it has levied a cess on the mill industry for the benefit of the Handloom industry. What this Resolution wants—and what I think every Member of the House would want—is that more intensive and extensive steps should be taken and efforts should be made to make this industry stand on its own legs and to make progress.

Sir, the position is that there are indeed difficulties in the way of the handloom industry surviving. But are we going to let it down on account of these difficulties and disabilities? The policy of the Government is to encourage cottage industries and small scale industries. Are we going to allow an industry which has been in existence for thousands of years and then find out new small and cottage industries for the benefit of the people, for the benefit of the private sector and the small industries sector? That is the question. We know that, because of the impact of modern machinery and modern fashions, the handloom industry is tottering. It

is not able to stand on its legs, as it was, say, fifty or a hundred years ago. But is it the reason why we must allow this important industry—important because it is second only to the agricultural industry of the country—to go out of existence? It is giving livelihood to at least a crore of people in the country. There may be difference in the computation of the figures of handlooms existing in the country but I have no doubt, whatever, that the figure adopted by the Handloom Board is correct, i.e., 22 lakhs of looms are in existence. If you take into consideration the number of looms that have gone out of existence for want of encouragement and for want of support, the figure would really be a very impressive one. The handloom industry is only second to the agricultural industry in the matter of giving employment to the people.

Sir, there are ways and means even today, as things stand under the present circumstances, to give more encouragement and better support to the handloom industry. The Government, of course, is doing what it can or what it thinks best in the interest of the industry; but taking even the exports, I know there are countries to the east and there are countries to the west of our country which would, with some tactful handling, be able and willing to take more of our handloom goods. Even today this position.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would you take more time—two minutes?

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL SAHEB: A few more minutes, say, five minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then you may continue after lunch.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM (Uttar Pradesh): Sir I want to submit that both these resolution—this one and the resolution to be moved by Mrs. Seeta Parmanand—are most important resolutions....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every resolution coming before the House is very important.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM:
We should sit through the lunch hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are
hon. Members willing to sit during
the lunch hour?

HON. MEMBERS: No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The
House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch
at half past two of the clock.
MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL
SAHEB: Mr. Deputy Chairman,
before the House adjourned for lunch,
I think, I was saying that there were
difficulties in the way of handloom
industries surviving. All the same,
those difficulties must be removed in
the interest of a vast number of peo-
ple of the land. My hon. friend, Mr.
Pattabiraman, also made the same
point. But in his speech, he emitted
fire and brimstone. Though I am not
capable of producing that feat, I can
understand the spirit behind it. He
expressed his deep concern for the
handloom industry which was giving
employment to the largest number of
people after agriculture in the country.
My friend, Mr. Saksena—I know
him very well for his generosity of
disposition and for his charitable
nature, but he—was terrified by the
vehemence of my friend, Mr. Patta-
biraman, and was misled into think-
ing that his vehemence was based on
something like Southern v Northern.
But I can assure him that any such
idea was far away from the mind of
my friend, Mr. Pattabiraman, whom
also I know very well. He made the
same point, as I said, that this indus-
try must not, under any circumstances,
be allowed to languish. There are
very good reasons, Sir, why this
industry must be resuscitated and
must be fitted into the modern economy
of the country. There are, of course,

definite ways, practicable ways, of
strengthening the industry and of
making it to progress to the satisfac-
tion and to the benefit of the country
as a whole, not only to the benefit of
the people concerned, but to the bene-
fit of the country as a whole.

Sir, improvements can be made in
the handloom industry, but then the
people who are engaged in this
industry are so very poor that they
cannot pay for those improvements.
Therefore it is that such vehement
appeals, such earnest appeals, are
being made to the Government. It is
the look-out of the Government to see
that these improvements are carried
out by the people. But while making
such improvements, one thing has to
be kept in mind very clearly, and
that is this. This handloom industry
is based upon the labour of a family
unit. The unit of this industry is a
family. And, therefore, the family
unit, under no circumstances, should
be impaired. The family spirit gives
content and satisfaction and happiness
to the people, which many other things
would not be able to give them.
Therefore, it is imperative and very
necessary that this family unit should
never be impaired or broken up by
any improvement that can be made,
may be, through a co-operative system
or any other system.

Then again, Sir, the exports of the
products of the handloom industry
can be accelerated, and I know defi-
nitely that there is room for more
consumption of our handloom pro-
ducts in certain foreign countries. And
if foreign trade is handled properly,
it has got room for expansion. And
there are capable people connected
with the industry and the trade who
can handle it satisfactorily. And it is
for the Government to get hold of
such people and do the thing through
our consulates and embassies in the
foreign countries.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is
time.

JANAB M. MUHAMMAD ISMAIL
SAHEB: Sir, I want to make only one

[Janab M. Muhammad Ismail Saheb.]

main point, though with the fault of having to repeat it. That is this, Sir.

There may be difficulties, and there are no doubt some difficulties. But the policy of the Government is to strengthen, or to create more and more cottage industries and small-scale industries, and also to expand the field of employment. Now if this industry is allowed to languish, and if it is removed from the field of employment, they have got to find out some other industry. And it would not be so very easy to find out any other industry in order to replace the handloom industry. Therefore, Sir, even at the cost of certain extra trouble and additional effort, this industry must be buttressed and must be made to progress. And it can certainly be made to progress, Sir.

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am in favour of this Resolution. And I wish to say that I am glad that the Textile Enquiry Committee is at least agreed on one thing with which I am in agreement, and that is, to put a ceiling on mill production. But even there, my hon. friend, Mr. Pattabiraman, has given an effective answer to the Committee when he said that they had put this ceiling rather too high, and very unreasonably so. And therefore, Sir, when we agree to that too high a figure, which was pitched upon by the Textile Committee, I hope the Government would consider our agreement to be highly generous, so far as the mill industry is concerned.

Then, Sir, there is the power-loom industry. It employs 50,000 people, for whom Mr. Dasappa has expressed genuinely sincere feelings. Now, we do not want these 50,000 people also to be thrown out of employment. Therefore, whatever cloth these power-looms are capable of producing, that ought to be taken out of the ceiling that is suggested by the Committee for the factory production. And it is not after all so very much when compared to what the mills are producing.

I need not go into the various figures, but it is only reasonable for us to expect the Government to agree with us when we say that the field for production that might be kept open for exploitation by the power-looms should be taken from out of the quota that is reserved for the mills.

Having said that, I would like to add one more word in regard to the power-looms *vis-a-vis* the handlooms. I think Mr. Dasappa's arguments, firstly, on the plane of more efficient production, and secondly, on the plane of a higher wage made possible by the power-loom—both these arguments—have been answered sufficiently succinctly by Mr. Pattabiraman. Therefore, Sir, I need not add anything more than to say that the arguments advanced by Mr. Dasappa in favour of the power-looms can also be made applicable to the mill industry, and for the very same reason. In fact all those who stood for the mill industry in the past had opposed the handlooms and for that very same reason the power-loom also came into the field just as the mill industry also came into the field and merely because the mill industry and the power-looms have come into the field and have been able to elbow out the handloom weavers, it is no reason to say that the handloom weavers should not be protected or that handloom weavers should not be enabled some day to hope for the capture of all the fields of production which today is obtained by the mills as well as the power-looms.

Coming to the other question whether the handlooms are capable of producing all the cloth that would be needed by our people when we have put a ceiling upon the total production that may be allowed for the power-looms as well as for the mill industry, I wish to assure the House that the handlooms are in a position to satisfy the demands of the nation. I have no doubt whatsoever at all about it but then keeping this very same point before themselves, the Textile Enquiry Committee, I am

afraid, indulged in some jugglery, knowingly or unknowingly—I wish to be charitable to them—and they made a figure according to their own arithmetic. I don't want to argue that point any further than say that the statistics are wrong, that their information is defective and if they were to question the authenticity of our information, we have just the same right for the simple reason that even according to them, there has not been taken any nation-wide and correct census of all the handlooms which are there first of all, which are capable of functioning today and also the number of people who can ply them and the capacity of their women also to supplement the efforts of their males in the weavers' families and the total capacity of the handlooms themselves of different types in different States to produce cloth. Therefore, I wish to repeat what I have said that their information is incorrect and the capacity of the handlooms to produce cloth needed by our population as apart from whatever may be produced by the mills and the power-looms would be more than adequate.

Then I would like to refer to the Five Year Plan prepared by the Handloom Board.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR: What about the difficulty of yarn? Can you throw some light?

PROF. G. RANGA: I am coming to it. So far as yarn supply is concerned, whether you allow the mills and the power-looms to produce all the cloth that you want or you leave that function to be discharged by the handlooms, that difficulty is bound to be there and an answer was given this morning by Mr. D. Narayan and it was supported also by Prof. Malkani. There is a new spinning wheel that has come in—the *Amber Charkha*. In addition to that, the Handloom Board have suggested the organization of a large number of small-sized spinning mills on a co-operative basis in different parts of the country to supplement the efforts of our own *Khaddar*

produce, *Amber Charkha* produce and others also.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: How many spinning units?

PROF. G. RANGA: It depends upon the Government. We have asked them to provide Rs. 15 crores for that.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: How many units?

PROF. G. RANGA: As many as you want. It is for my hon. friend to come forward and see to the construction of these. This is a queer argument. Supposing we are not able to produce all the yarn that we want in this country either through the mills existing today or the mills that the Government is going to construct cooperatively or through their own ownership, what are we going to do? Are we not going to import? Merely because it would be necessary for us to import and we don't want to encourage it, is that any reason why you are going to leave the field open to the mills and how I ask the mills will be able to produce.....

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: Why attribute it to the Committee?

PROF. G. RANGA: I am not attributing it to your Committee. I am attributing it to the Handloom Board. The Handloom Board said the capacity of the spinning mill industry in this country to produce all the yarn that is needed for the existing population as well as for the new population that is expected to come into existence during the next five years is not adequate. Therefore more spinning mills are needed and there we have suggested that instead of going in for State Spinning Mills or for private enterprise spinning mills, you help our Handloom Board to bring into existence through the co-operation of our own weavers a number of as many small-sized co-operative spinning mills as possible. That is not the question before us. I take it for granted that all the yarn

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

that is needed in our country for all cloth will have to be produced anyhow and what steps have got to be taken I have already indicated. If there are any other steps too, those steps may be taken by the Government of India. Therefore now I am concerned only with this—whether the handloom weaving industry today is so organized as to be capable of producing the cloth that we want. It was suggested by my friend Mr. Dasappa and various others that handlooms should be modernized. Sir, I wish to submit that we are taking steps in order to see that the handlooms are modernised. A number of those shuttle-looms, for instance, are to be replaced by fly shuttle-looms. In the last three years alone we have achieved this conversion to the tune of 27,000 looms. Then the strength of the co-operative movement is today the highest among the cottage industries—among our handloom weavers. During the last three years again, we were able to raise the number of people who are brought into the cooperative movement from 6,82,000 to 8,78,000. You just think of any other cottage industry where you can show so much progress. We are going ahead. I want assistance. Provided assistance is forthcoming, handloom weaving today is capable of achieving the results that the country expects of it and that is why we have made a budget for Rs. 120 crores for the next five years. The Government of India have agreed to place at the disposal of the handloom industry through the Cess proceeds funds to the tune of Rs. 25 to Rs 30 crores. We want another Rs. 70 crores to be placed at the disposal of this industry, not entirely as a gift. Most of it would go as a loan—some of it interest-free, some of it at very cheap rates but nevertheless the whole of it has to come back and we are lending this money through the State Governments. Therefore the money is not likely to be lost. We have already brought into existence a number of Apex State Co-operative Societies. We have

also organised All India Handloom Marketing Co-operative Societies. We have also appointed a number of agents in the different parts of the country and we propose to appoint many more also in order to push up the export of our handloom cloth. All these steps are being taken today by the Handloom Board. This Handloom Board was appointed by the Government of India. It itself says unanimously that it would be possible to expect of every loom a production of 8 yards per day whereas the Committee expected to achieve only 2·5 yards. You can see from that—from these two simple figures alone—how they have been too conservative. My point is this that this Committee has missed the point and as Mr. Pattabiraman has already made it clear, it had also misinterpreted or misunderstood the terms of reference placed before it. Unfortunately for it, times have changed, unfortunately for the Members of the Committee also because many of them happen to be Gandhians and also Congress people, and these two friends of mine—personal friends of mine, for whose personal integrity I have great respect and faith—somehow, I don't know how, deluded themselves from Gandhism to Manchesterism, and from Manchesterism they have come to the latest English method of diffusion of industries and they have forgotten Gandhism completely. It is true that Mahatma Gandhi was completely a votary of Khadi but at the same time he made concessions towards the handloom weavers. Why? That is where I come to the question of employment. The whole question has got to be looked at from the point of view of human beings and their employment and their maintenance. If you were to look at it from that point of view, you would never hesitate to agree with me. And this is also in accord with Gandhiji's forty years old thesis. It was the thesis of Mahatma Gandhi that the men in the hand-weaving industry have got to be given first preference. Thereafter, other people have got to come. for the

simple reason that this industry has been able to provide them—not sufficient—but some maintenance, somehow or other. This has given employment for more than a crore of our people whereas the whole of the mill industry employ only 7.5 lakhs of people. You multiply it four times and still it will come to only about 30 lakhs and so it maintains only about 30 lakhs, although it has had for the last 150 years the support from an alien government, as well as from some of our economists and industrialists. With all this, the power-looms produce only a little more than a fifth as much as the handlooms and they provide work only for 50,000 people and maintain only about 2.5 lakhs. But on the other side, Sir, you have these one crore of people depending on the handlooms, who have remained loyal to their profession. Should we not be loyal to them, feel happy and be affectionate towards them because they have not given up their profession all these years in spite of the left-handed treatment given to them. Therefore, if you look at it from the point of view of employment, everything will become clear. All I would now say is that the Committee had missed the bus. But fortunately for us, the Government has changed its policy and the Congress Party has also changed its policy, and loyal Congressman as he is, my hon. friend Mr. Kanungo also, although he has been promoted in another sphere, is now prepared to implement the new policy of the Government of India, in spite of his own report.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want to speak on this Resolution or on the Resolution on the N.C.C.?

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM: On both, Sir. But I will not take much time

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यदि हम पिछले पांच सौ वर्षों के इतिहास पर दृष्टि डालें तो तुरन्त हमारे मन में एक प्रश्न उठता है और वह प्रश्न यह है कि वह भारतीय जनता, जो दो तीन सौ वर्ष पहले इतनी वीर थी कि जितने भी विदेशी

आततायी आये, उसने उनका डट कर मुकाबला किया और जो स्वतंत्रता के लिये हर समय अपने प्राण न्याछावर करने के लिये तैयार रहती थी वह लगातार दो सौ वर्षों के लिये गुलाम बनी रह गई। श्रीमन्, यह प्रश्न उठते ही हमें इसका उत्तर जानने में कोई देर नहीं लगती। इन दो सौ वर्षों की निरन्तर गुलामी और राष्ट्रीय जीवन की निजीवता का सबसे बड़ा मुख्य कारण यह है कि जो अंगरेज बहादुर हमारे यहां आये उन्होंने आकर सीधे सीधे मुकाबला नहीं किया, बल्कि उन्होंने एक चाल खेती। उन्होंने हमारे देश के आर्थिक ढांचे को तोड़ने के लिये लोगों के उद्योग धन्यों को नष्ट करना प्रारम्भ किया, हमारे देश का सारा व्यापार ले लिया और जनता बिल्कुल आर्थिक रूप से परतंत्र बन गई, गांवों का आर्थिक ढांचा टूट गया और राष्ट्र की जो शक्ति थी वह क्षीण हो गई, तब उन्होंने राजनीतिक सत्ता की ओर अपना हाथ बढ़ाया। उस समय जनता में इतनी शक्ति ही नहीं रह गई थी कि वह उनका मुकाबला करती। इसी लिये महात्मा जी ने बड़े ही साफ शब्दों में कहा था कि अंग्रेजों ने हमारे देश को जो सब से बड़ा नुकसान पहुंचाया, वह हमारे देश के आर्थिक ढांचे को तोड़ना था। हमारे गांवों का ऐसा ढांचा था कि उसके द्वारा वे स्वयं स्वावलम्बी बन जाते थे, परन्तु अंग्रेजों ने उस ढांचे को तोड़कर जितना हमारा अहित किया उतना और किसी प्रकार से नहीं किया।

श्रीमन्, आजादी के बाद से हमारे देश के कर्णधारों और विचारकों का ध्यान गांवों की आर्थिक स्थिति की ओर गया है। यहां पर कुछ भाइयों ने कहा कि क्या हम प्रिमिटिव एज की ओर जाना चाहते हैं कि जो इस प्रकार मिलों को छोड़ कर हैंडलूम की ओर बढ़ रहे हैं। इस प्रकार की विचारधारा ने ही आज हमें आजादी के बाद इन आठ वर्षों में उतना आगे नहीं बढ़ने दिया जितना कि हमें बढ़ना चाहिये था। श्रीमन्, यह कौन नहीं जानता है कि मिलों का बना हुआ कपड़ा या मिलों की उत्पादित वस्तुएं ज्यादा सुन्दर होती हैं, ज्यादा सरलता से बन जाती हैं, लेकिन साथ ही साथ हम सब यह

[श्रीमती सावित्री दवी निगम]

समझ चुके हैं और मिल की बनी वस्तुएं हमें यह मानने पर विवश करती हैं, यह स्पष्ट करती हैं कि जो रुपया मिलों के द्वारा कमाया जाता है वह उन बड़े लोगों के पास जाता है जिन को उसकी आवश्यकता नहीं है। दूसरी सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि मशीन के द्वारा वस्तुओं के उत्पादन करने से उतने गरीब मजदूरों को रोजी नहीं मिल पाती है कि जितने मजदूरों को हाथ के द्वारा वस्तुओं के उत्पादन करने से मिलती है। आज हम सभी लोग इस बात को भली प्रकार समझ चुके हैं कि यदि हम देश की बेकारी को दूर करना चाहते हैं, यदि हम चाहते हैं कि हमारे गांवों का आर्थिक ढांचा फिर से बने तो हमारे देश में जितने भी उत्पादन के साधन हैं उन सब का विकेंद्रीकरण करना होगा। जब एक बार हमने विकेंद्रीकरण की नीति को मान लिया है तो फिर इस प्रकार की आपत्तियां उठाना, जैसी कि आज हैंडलूम को ही लेकर उठाई जा रही हैं, सचमुच हमारे लिये बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है, बड़ी ही शोचनीय बात है।

श्रीमन्, यह कौन नहीं जानता है कि जो ४१२ लाख पोंड हमें सूत का उत्पादन करना है यदि वह मिल के द्वारा उत्पादित होगा तो उसमें मुश्किल से हम पांच छः लाख लोगों को रोजगार दे पायेंगे। लेकिन वही यदि हम अम्बर चर्खे के द्वारा उत्पादित करेंगे तो हम ५२ लाख आदिमियों को रोजगार दिला सकेंगे। अब आप ही बतलाइये कि इसमें किसी भी विवाद की क्या आवश्यकता है। जब यह बात निश्चित हो चुकी है, जब यह बात सब को विदित हो चुकी है कि हम इस प्रकार न केवल ५२ लाख लोगों को रोजगार देने जा रहे हैं बल्कि साथ ही साथ जितने भी हैंडलूम वीवर्स हैं उनको नाना प्रकार की सुविधाएं देने की व्यवस्था कर रहे हैं।

श्रीमन्, हैंडलूम वीवर्स के लिये जो सब से बड़ी दुर्भाग्य की बात है वह यह है कि उन लोगों को समय पर कभी भी सूत नहीं मिल पाता। सूत

का बाजार हमेशा उन शोषकों के हाथ में है, उन पूंजीपतियों के हाथ में है, जो कि हैंडलूम नष्ट करने के लिये हमेशा तैयार रहते हैं और वह कभी भी यह महसूस नहीं करते कि उनके इस प्रकार बाजार के उतार चढ़ाव करने के कारण कभी कभी सैकड़ों हैंडलूमों को बन्द रहना पड़ता है और सैकड़ों घरों में चूल्हा नहीं जलता है। इस लिये इस प्रकार की दलीलों में कि यदि हम हैंडलूम को या अम्बर चर्खे को उत्पादन का मुख्य केंद्र मानेंगे, मुख्य साधन मानेंगे, मुख्यता देंगे, तो हम प्रिमिटिव एज में पहुँच जायेंगे, या हम देश का उत्पादन कम करने वाले हैं, अब कोई भी बल नहीं रहा है। यह एक बेबुनियाद सी चीज बन गई है। इस लिये, श्रीमन्, मैं यह चाहूंगी कि टक्सटाइल कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में जिन बातों को ओवरलुक करने की चेष्टा की गई है उन पर हमारे मिनिस्टर महोदय ध्यान दें और साफ साफ यह घोषणा करें कि हैंडलूम को डेवलप करने के लिये जो थोड़ी सी रकम रखी गई है वह बढ़ाई जायगी। साथ ही जो पांच हजार मिलियन यार्ड कपड़े पर सीलिंग लगाने की घोषणा की गई उसका मैं स्वागत करती हूँ। लेकिन, श्रीमन्, आपके द्वारा मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह प्रार्थना करूंगी कि वे इस बात की घोषणा करें कि आज हम जितने सूत के उत्पादन की कमी महसूस कर रहे हैं उसकी पूर्ति अम्बर चर्खे के द्वारा की जायगी। मैं यह भी आशा करती हूँ कि सरकार कुछ और रुपया देकर अम्बर चर्खे को मुख्यता प्रदान करेगी। यदि सरकार ने ऐसा किया तो टक्सटाइल उद्योग के विकेंद्रीकरण के साथ ही साथ सरकार द्वारा उन ग्राम उद्योगों के जीवन में भी एक आर्थिक क्रांति लाई जा सकेगी जो कि आज एक प्रकार के आर्थिक अभाव के कारण बिल्कुल मरणासन्न से हो गये हैं।

3 P. M.

मैं इस प्रस्ताव का हार्दिक समर्थन करती हूँ और चाहती हूँ कि हमारे माननीय सदस्यों ने जो भी सिफारिशें की हैं उनको ध्यान में

रखते हुये मिनिस्टर महोदय एक ऐसा आवासन दूँ एक ऐसी घोषणा करूँ जिससे हम लोगों को यह विश्वास हो जाय कि सरकार की नीति बिल्कुल स्पष्ट हो चुकी है और वह इन दलीलों से और पूँजीपतियों के प्रोपोगेंड से किसी प्रकार भी प्रभावित होने वाली नहीं है।

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN- Mr. Kanungo

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR (Nominated) Sir, I want to say a few words

MR DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have already called the Minister This is about handloom and the fixation of the quantity of cloth to be produced by the mills

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : जी हा इसी के बारे में मैं दो मिनट में कुछ अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ। एन० सी० सी० के रजाल्युशन के बारे में बोलने के लिये मैंने प्रार्थना की है और उस पर बोलूंगा, लेकिन इसके बारे में भी एक दो बात अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ।

उपसभापति महोदय मैं ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लूँगा। मैंने इसके लिये वक्त मांगा नहीं था लेकिन एक बात दिल में आई है उसको अर्ज कर देना चाहता हूँ। यह यह है कि यह सही है कि हमें जनता से काटवट और रिश्ता कायम रखना चाहिये, हमारे हैंडलूम और चरखे कायम रहने चाहिये और हमें हर वह कोशिश करनी चाहिये जिससे ये कायम रहे क्योंकि इसी से हम ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों के लिये काम का बन्दोबस्त कर सकते हैं लेकिन इसके साथ ही यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि हम अपनी उडान को अपनी फ्लाइट्स को रोक ले और इस मशीन के युग में हम अपने आप को बाध ले। किसी सेटीमेंट्स की वजह से या किसी इमोशन की वजह से हम यह तय कर लें कि हम और नहीं उड़ेंगे। हम दोनों चीजों को साथ साथ ले कर चल सकें तो यह बेहतर होगा। यही एक मेरी तूच्छ प्रार्थना है और मामूली सी बात

है। हम अपने हैंडलूम को और चरखे को जितना भी इनकर्रज कर सकें, करें और इसके लिये जितनी भी कोशिश हो सके वह करें क्योंकि इससे हम अपनी ग्रामीण जनता की परवरिश कर सकते हैं, पर साथ ही साथ हम अपने मिल्स की ओर भी ध्यान दें। अगर हम उनकी तरफ से सां जाय और उनको डिस्कर्रज करते चल जाय तो कहीं यह न हो कि हम पीछे रह जाय। इसीलिये अगर काम दोनों तरफ से हो तो काम आगे बढ़ेगा और काम करने वालों को फायदा होगा। यह सवाल उठ सकता है कि उसकी खपत कहा होगी। तो उसका यही स्वरूप हो सकता है कि हम ऐसी व्यवस्था करें कि वह बाहर जाय। हमारे मिलों का काम बहुत अच्छा से अच्छा हो रहा है, बहुत खूबसूरत काम है, बड़ा सुन्दर और प्यारा कपड़ा बनने लगा है और अनेक फारन मार्केटों में जाने लगा है। तो उसके लिये हम कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था करें जैसी कि इंग्लैंड में है। इंग्लैंड में विल्स्की बनती है लेकिन उसको वहां के लोग स्वयं नहीं पीते, उसको बाहर भेजते हैं ताकि बाहर के मार्केटों से पैसा आयें। वं साउथ अफ्रीका, आस्ट्रेलिया और कनाडा से जो आती है उसको पीते हैं। इसी तरह से इंग्लैंड में बना हुआ बेहतरीन कपड़ा फ्रांस में बहुत मिलता है लेकिन वह इंग्लैंड में बहुत महंगा मिलता है। इसी तरह हम अपने देश में हैंडलूम के कपड़े का प्रचार करें और कोई ऐसी व्यवस्था करें कि वही कपड़ा लोग पा सकें, लोग मिल के कपड़े की तरफ न दौड़ें और उसके लिये डिस्कर्रज हों। मिल का कपड़ा बाहर भेजना पड़ता है क्योंकि अभी हमारे यहाँ कपड़ा नहीं जा रहा है वहां भी वह पड़ुचे और लोग खरीदें। इस तरह से इस कार्ड के द्वारा हमारे यहाँ पैसा आयेगा और हम उसको दूसरे कामों में लगा सकेंगे। हमको बहुत सा पैसा बाहर भेजना पड़ता है क्योंकि अभी हमारे यहाँ बैसिक इंडस्ट्रीज बहुत कम हैं और अभी शुरू हुई हैं। तो किसी न किसी रूप में जो हमारा पैसा बाहर जाता है उसको हम कपड़े के पैसे से बैलेस कर सकेंगे। तो हम अपने देश के लिये यही कोशिश करें कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा हैंडलूम

[श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर]

का कपड़ा बने और ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों को गांवों में काम मिले और जो मेहनत और मजदूरी करने वाले हैं उनको मौका मिले कि वे सेल्फ सप्लायिंग हो जायें। जो लोग इस काम में लगे हैं उनकी हम रक्षा करें और उनको उठावें लेकिन हम ऐसा न करें कि मिलों के काम को, मिलों के खाज को और मिलों की उड़ान को रोक दें। मेरी इतनी ही प्रार्थना है।

SHRI N. KANUNGO: Sir, I find myself in a rather awkward position and at a certain disadvantage. The debate today has gone in the direction of a criticism of the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee of which I had the proud privilege of being the Chairman than to the limited contents of the Resolution before the House. Therefore, my own inclinations are to be much more irrelevant than one should be and dilate upon the virtues of the recommendations of the Committee rather than confine myself to the Resolution but I know very well that under your vigilant eyes, I cannot do it. Whatever be my own inclinations, I have to confine myself rigidly to the contents of the Resolution before the House. As you will see, the Resolution reads as follows:

"This House, having taken into consideration the recommendations of the Textile Enquiry Committee, is of opinion that production of cloth by mills should be limited to 5,000 million yards per year and that after the year 1955-56 all additional production should be by the handloom sector."

Though the Textile Enquiry Committee has been quoted, I beg to submit that out of 137 recommendations made by the Committee, only one is concerned with the Resolution before the House and that relates to pegging down the production of mill cloth to a figure of 5,000 million yards. When the Committee made that recommendation, it gave a whole plan. This

result could be obtained only if the plan as a whole could be worked out. You cannot get this result without taking the other steps recommended by the Committee. Those may be right or wrong; I do not say that the Committee has made recommendations which are the only right ones. In fact, in the body of the report, it has been specifically mentioned that the problem is so vast and conditions so changing—and changing so quickly—that the last word on the subject cannot be said at any day or at any given time. Specifically, the Committee recommended that the position should be reviewed in detail at intervals of not more than six years and in between also the proposition should be kept under review from year to year and adequate steps taken. Therefore, Sir, in spite of the rhetoric of my hon. friend, Mr. Pattabiraman, I would have been happy, as Chairman of the Committee, to accept the thesis that instead of pegging down the production of the mills at a certain figure, we ought to have envisaged the production of handloom cloth at a higher figure and left the other sectors alone. Broadly speaking, the consumption of cloth is roughly about 4,000 million yards plus 1,400 million yards which means 5,400 million yards.

I would draw your attention to one of the appendices of the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee wherein a study of the demand curve for textiles for the last thirty years is given. It shows that a 10 per cent increase or reduction in the price of cloth results in the curve going in the reverse direction so far as consumption is concerned. That is, a reduction of two annas per rupee roughly has resulted in an increase of 1,000 million yards of cloth and an increase of two annas in the rupee has meant the reduction in consumption of 1,000 million yards of cloth in the country. In other words, Sir, the margin of the purchasing power of our people is so thin that a price variation of this small amount of 10 per cent makes such a great deal of difference in the consumption of an article which is

essential. No one can say that today or for the matter of that during the last thirty years the people of India have been adequately clothed. The highest consumption for clothing we have reached is somewhere about 15 to 16 yards per head, that too on the average, and all averages are deceptive to some extent. Therefore, Sir, it boils down to this that until and unless cloth which is a primary necessity of life is available at a particular price at a given period within the purchasing power of the people, the bulk of the population have to deprive themselves of that necessity. That means, in that condition, their choice is always between food and cloth and in cloth itself the price is the criterion. Therefore, Sir, the Committee recommended a series of steps to be taken and one of them is that the restriction of the production by the mills to the figure of 5,000 million yards should be possible. Sir, it was urged before the Committee by several people and several people good in the theory of economics who came to us and discussed the matter with us thought it would be possible to produce 8,200 million yards of cloth by 1960 on the basis of 18 yards per head by setting up additional mills. Apart from the fact that adequate machinery has got to be imported, most of it, and a huge amount of capital has got to be invested in it, that will impoverish our economy in the sense that the consumer of the cloth which is every man and woman in this country, cannot improve his purchasing power if the total economy of the country is not improved, total economy of the country in the sense that the large bulk of the population have an increase in their purchasing power. However much cloth you might produce and at however cheap a price you might produce, it won't be consumed because the people will not have the wherewithal to buy it. Under imaginary conditions, if I were able to offer cloth at the rate of, say, four annas per yard, if there is not that much income going round the country, no one will be able

to buy. These facts, Sir, have been adequately brought out in the discussions which have been going on for the last several months in connection with the Plan and the Second Five Year Plan is based upon the main target, that is, the total economy of the country, that means, that the total income of the population has got to be increased and one of the methods of increasing that total income is by resuscitating the handloom industry.

Many friends have said that the handloom has unlimited scope to increase its production. I wish it were true. There are certain factors which give one hope that it is possible. For example, the skill of a weaver, which cannot be acquired in one generation, is there, and that is the most valuable asset. But as against that, there are so many handicaps. The first handicap is the raw material for cloth, the yarn, and yarn in adequate quantities is just not available.

PROF. G. RANGA: But that is a queer argument; then do you propose to import it?

SHRI N. KANUNGO: I am coming to it. Let me develop my point. In fact, if Prof. Ranga is anxious to know it now, I may say that one of the recommendations of the Committee is that if yarn is not available in particular varieties and particular qualities, then it should be imported in the interests of the handloom weaver.

PROF. G. RANGA: We were prepared to accept it at your hands.

SHRI N. KANUNGO: But, Sir, that is an extreme step. It is possible. We grow cotton; it is possible to produce that yarn. And how can it be produced? Well, I do not want to go into the controversy which has been raised in this House about the possibility of producing an adequate quantity of yarn by the *Amber Charkha* or by other methods of yarn production. For one thing I know that the potentiality of the conventional *Charkha* is established; the production

[Shri N. Kanungo.]
of 2½ ounces for a full day of work in the conventional Charkha is established. But I am yet to know that the potentiality and capacity of the *Amber Charkha* has been established

I am aware of the discussions which have been going on in the Village Industries Board and elsewhere among people who have better brains than mine, who have better experience than mine, and they feel and rightly feel that until the potentiality of the *Amber Charkha* is proved by large-scale experimentation, no one can today with confidence say that adequate quantity of yarn will be available through that source—let alone the problems of organisation and production. As a Government we feel it our bounden duty to provide the raw material for the handlooms which are in existence. Let it not be said that by the remissness of the Government the handloom weaver has been deprived of his source of supply of yarn. The Textile Enquiry Committee has recommended that it will require nearly two million spindles to produce enough yarn to produce the extra quantity of 1600 million yards of cloth by handlooms in the course of the coming six years.

Now we are faced with the situation that in the year 1953-54 and up to July, 1955, licences have been taken out for 17,36,288 spindles out of which only 4 lakhs, 50 thousand odd spindles are in position. That means, barely one fourth of the spindleage for which licences were issued have been installed.

Professor Ranga read out the recommendations of the Handloom Board. Rightly the Handloom Board has laid the greatest emphasis on the source of supply of the raw material of yarn and they have said that all sources of supply should be explored and decentralized spinning units should be set up by Government or by a co-operative agency if other possibilities are not available. Now I want to emphasise that by decentralized spinning units what the Board means and

what everybody familiar with the textile problem understands is spinning units of 12,000 spindles.

PROF. G. RANGA: 10,000.

SHRI N. KANUNGO: Though the conventional economic unit of a spinning mill is said to be 25,000, yet by experience in our country with proper location, proper availability of raw materials and consumers' proximity 10,000 to 12,000 spindleage has been found to be workable. As against that there is a volume of opinion in our country that if we set up all the spinning capacity, then the future of the production of yarn by simpler methods like *Charkha* or the *Amber Charkha* will be prejudiced. The Government, as such, have an open mind about it. They have not taken any decision on it yet. After the Planning Commission has gone into the whole question of which they are seized, a policy decision will have to be taken and therefore that is one of the reasons why the recommendations of the Textile Enquiry Committee as a whole have not been discussed and finally decided upon by the Government. Therefore, today I stand before this House in a very awkward position inasmuch as the decision on the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee is not available.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: May I have an indication as to by what time the Government hope to reach a decision?

SHRI N. KANUNGO: I am sorry that I have to tell my colleague that I cannot give any time limit because it depends upon so many contingencies. But as far as this Resolution is concerned, the Government have been following the policy of not permitting any increase in the weaving capacity in the mill sector. At the same time I must submit that I am not in a position to accept the Resolution as it stands because the matter is still being discussed and if it is possible to increase the capacity of the handloom production which in spite of the jibes that have been showered on the Government.....

PROF. G. RANGA: No; not on the Government.

SHRI N. KANUNGO: Sir, given proper organisation and with certain contingencies happening, it is possible to produce cloth through the efforts of the handloom weaver—not by the handlooms as they are—much more than the projected capacity which has been recommended by the Committee.....

PROF. G. RANGA: Your Committee? Our Board has recommended 5,000 million yards.

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI (Nominated): On the basis of hand-made yarn or mill-made yarn?

SHRI N. KANUNGO: On the basis of mill-made yarn.....

DR. RADHA KUMUD MOOKERJI: Then that is not *khadi*.

SHRI N. KANUNGO: And that is another reason why I am not prepared to accept the Resolution as it is because it is said that with the investigations going on about the development and improvement of the *Amber Charkha* and with organisation it is quite possible that not only these 3,000 million yards but much more could be produced. And they would be available, mind you, at the right price—I do not say at any price—which will be within the means of the people. And it will not be indefinite time; we will find the results in another two or three years. Therefore the total production might be much more than the 3,000 million yards which we are projecting at the moment. I must frankly admit that neither the Textile Enquiry Committee nor the Government have any data to confidently come before the House and say that this will be the quantity of cloth that could be produced in the year, say, 1956-57 or something like that. Sir, I crave your understanding and sympathy a little. If this August House pegs the production at 5,000 million yards and supposing the export increases, what happens? To that

extent it will not be available for internal consumption.

PROF. G. RANGA: The Export Promotion Committee is useless.

SHRI N. KANUNGO: Therefore, I submit that at least for two or three years to come, till the position becomes clear—it is quite possible a particular method of production of yarn would be found more economical—it is not desirable to peg production at any level.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI: Meanwhile you should stop the installation of further spindles.

SHRI N. KANUNGO: We are concerned with limiting the production of cloth by mills; we are not concerned with spindleage now. That matter could be discussed outside the House or by bringing forward a separate resolution in which I expect my hon. friend Prof. Ranga to make a valuable contribution. As it is, though the Government—not only after the recommendation of the Textile Enquiry Committee but even before the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee was available to the Government—have been following the policy of not increasing the weaving capacity of the mill sector, yet they are not in a position to accept the Resolution because the coming two to three years will create conditions where nothing can be said with certainty.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA: What about the existing production of power-looms?

SHRI N. KANUNGO: As I said, the recommendations of the Textile Enquiry Committee are 137 in number and the Members of the Committee including myself have thought that those are the wisest counsel that could be offered but it is for others, particularly hon. Members of this House to judge whether that claim to wisdom is justified or not. In the meantime I am sorry I cannot accept the Resolution as it is, though the Government have been following

[Shri N. Kanungo.]

a policy of not increasing the loom-age, and they will continue following that policy for some time to come. I must however give a warning to the House that to talk glibly of being able to produce 3,200 million yards is not correct. In spite of the assertion of my friend Prof. Ranga it is not possible to produce it at a price at which it can be taken by the consumers unless so many other conditions are satisfied. And one of the main conditions is that yarn of the right type must be available and I insist that it should be of the right type and right price. Today—and Prof. Ranga will bear me out in this—you go from Assam to Cape Comorin and you will find that certain manufacturers of yarn have got a premium; the weaver wants only that yarn. You cannot force down the throat of the weaver any yarn that you like or the planners of this country like. And the weaver is our primary concern. He is the producing unit. His tool, his loom, his preparatory process is said to be sacrosanct. Prof. Ranga will bear me out that today in India we have at least 3,000 varieties of looms ranging from the most primitive loin loom to the latest semi-automatic loom described in the report of the Committee. The semi-automatic loom in spite of Prof. Ranga's allergy to it is not an invention of the Committee or of anybody else. It has been in this country for the last 40 years. It is not an invention of recent years. It was an invention of the ingenious weavers of Western India and they have been working on it for the last 40 years.

Sir, the time is running out and though my temptation to dilate upon the recommendations of the Enquiry Committee is very strong, I feel that it is irrelevant and you will not allow it. So I submit that for the limited purposes of this Resolution, though the Government have been following the same policy as is embodied in the Resolution and they will continue to follow it, yet they are not prepared to accept this Resolution because conditions may change from time to time.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: If it comes to a shortage of yarn for looms, will you permit your own textile mills to manufacture the yarn or will you import it from outside?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a matter of detail.

SHRI N. KANUNGO: That is a contingency upon another contingency on which I cannot give a reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kishen Chand is not here to reply. So, I am putting the Resolution to the House. The question is:

"This House, having taken into consideration the recommendations of the Textile Enquiry Committee, is of opinion that production of cloth by mills should be limited to 5,000 million yards per year and that after the year 1955-56 all additional production should be by the handloom sector."

The motion was negatived.

RESOLUTION RE COMPULSORY TRAINING IN N.C.C. OR A.C.C. FOR STUDENTS

DR SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move the Resolution standing in my name, namely:—

"This House is of opinion that with a view to inculcating a spirit of discipline and leadership among the youth of the country, the Central Government should recommend to State Governments to introduce compulsory training in N.C.C. or A.C.C. for all students for one year each at the High School and the University stages of education."

Though on the face of it, it might seem that this Resolution states nothing new but states merely what is an accepted principle, I would submit that very often these accepted principles