

[Shri B. N. Datar.] are anxious that they should be very-strict in this matter and that is the reason why Government have stated that there should be a special sanction obtained, not merely a post *facto* sanction but prior sanction before he enters into any such transaction.

SHRI B. GUPTA: What about rule 4?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you press your amendment, Mr. Mathur?

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: In view of the assurance given and the information given by the hon. Minister, I do not press amendment No. (i) but I do press amendment No. (ii) I remain absolutely unconvinced.

\* Amendment No. IV (i) was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"In Rule 13, sub-rule (5), for the words 'except with the previous sanction of the Government' the words 'except without informing the Government' be substituted."

The motion was negatived.

**THE CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT  
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954—  
*continued.***

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We go back to the Central Excises and Salt (Amendment) Bill. We are left with one hour and twenty minutes and so the hon. Members will have to be brief.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support this Bill. This is a small one and this enunciates principles which are of great importance to the development of our country in the industrial field and in a manner which is suitable to

"For text of amendment, *vide* col. 3306 *supra.*

our country. The measure is very important in that Government, immediately after seeing four or five machines installed in the country, came with an ordinance in July to stop these machines competing with the manufacture of bins which is carried on by nearly six lakh or more people. This, Sir, is a great departure and since this Parliament met, this is the second occasion on which cottage industries of this nature are being protected by the State. The first was the case of the handloom industry and the second is the biris but I would request the hon. the Deputy Finance Minister to look into the cases of other such industries in this country as are handicapped owing to mechanisation and the employees of cottage industries have been suffering for want of assistance from the State. I think, Sir, if he examines the industries, he will find that many articles can be produced by the cottage industries. I think there will be about 50 articles and since there is unemployment and under-employment in the country, it is necessary to devise measures in order that the field of cottage industries is not taken up by machanised industries. The hon. the Deputy Finance Minister has pointed out that the cost of production is Re. 1-14-0 less when the *biris* are manufactured by these machines. It is quite true, Sir. He has also pointed out that in this process one man will do in place of twelve in the ordinary process, that is, the ratio is 1 : 12. Therefore 50,000 workers can produce all *biris* if machines are installed. This is a situation, which, I think, is well recognised.

He has now to divert his attention to other products also where such inroads are made in their manufacture in the cottage industry. The situation is all the more important because we have made great industrial and agricultural progress in the country, but this agricultural and industrial progress in a democracy will be useless if there is no adequate employment or full employment which ix

required in the country. And, Sir, unless Government examines these issues they will not be able to solve the unemployment or the under-employment problem in the country, which is so very necessary. This is the second item they have taken, but I fail to understand why they have not devoted their attention to so many other commodities on which similar action can be taken and taken in time. I would again request the hon. the Deputy Minister to look into this matter, knowing as he does that there is large-scale under-employment in our country and our democracy in spite of our progress in other directions will fall only on the ground of under-employment. We are no doubt making great progress. But as long as the Constitution provides that there must be full employment in the country for all people or they should be provided with a fair amount of work, we have to take all measures in order to achieve that object, and I think, Sir, we have not adopted the measures in a (manner in which we should.

Now, Sir, with regard to the few remarks which were made by the two previous speakers on this Bill, I think they did not give the exact picture as to how this biri manufacture by machines is affecting the cottage industry producers. They said that our exports would suffer. In the first place it is to be made clear that this excise duty of Rs. 3 or Rs. 5 or Rs. 10 or Re. 1 is not applicable to exports. So those who are able to export and those who want to employ these machines for export purposes only have no fear of this levy of such duty. So there is no ground to complain on that account. Government very well knows that if we want to have international markets our terms should be competitive with those of other countries and that we should take to modern machines if we want to export our products to other countries. Otherwise we will lose all our export markets. There is no dispute about that and all excises and cesses are levied

on that basis. Therefore, if those who are installing these machines—and there are five of them—if they want to export the bins I think Government will welcome it and they may even give assistance to that industry, but they must guarantee that these machines are used not to displace the men in the industry who are doing it on for domestic consumption and that they make for sales outside the country. In that case Sir, their efforts will be welcome. They may even make more inventions and they may employ more machines for that purpose, in making their *biris* competitive in foreign markets and improving the standard of quality and their efforts will be welcome. I think these points were missed by the two previous speakers.

Another point raised was that there must be co-operative societies. Sir, co-operative societies are not built in a day. But even if co-operative societies exist and these activities are carried on in cottages, then I think there is nothing that comes in their way and they will not have to pay this excise if each one is employing this machine in his own household because the definition is very clear. Formerly I was myself under the misapprehension whether this definition was proper or not but when I see the provision made in clause 2 of the Bill, namely, "(3) *Biris* in the manufacture of which any process has been conducted with the aid of machines operated with or without the aid of power" my misapprehension is gone. It is 'machines'; it is plural. If it is 'machine', then, I think, Sir, the objection would have been reasonable because in cottages or households also one may employ a die and a die will be a machine for cutting leaves. If it was 'machine' then he will come under this clause to pay the excise but the word 'machines' is specifically used and naturally in a cottage UM cannot use 5 machines or 10 machine to carry on the activities and if *an*\* does that.....

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar): May I know where it is said that in the machine-made process there should be more than one machine?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: You are again mistaken. Read the provision made in clause 2: "(3) *Biris* in the manufacture of which any process has been conducted with the aid of machines", etc. With the aid of 'machines' not 'machine'. That is the difference.

SHRI GOPI KRISHNA VIJAIVAR-GIYA (Madhya Bharat): Plural does not include the singular?

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: If it is by 'machine' then only one process is there and in a cottage scale industry if a man is working with one machine he will be exempt from this duty. That is the whole position. The duty is there. The die is a machine and the die is for cutting leaves. It is a machine no doubt. Now, Sir, if it is employed in the cottages the duty will not be collected from a family which is working on a machine because it is specifically mentioned here. If it had been 'machine or machines' the case would have been otherwise, but it is not like that. Therefore, Sir, those activities, if they are carried on legitimately then they will be exempt. For Mr. Sinha's satisfaction, if he requires, there is another clause in Chapter VII. Section 37 (1) says that the Central Government may make rules to carry into effect the purposes of this Act, and clause (iii) of section 37 (2) says "prohibit absolutely or with such exceptions, or subject to such conditions as the Central Government thinks fit, the production or manufacture, or any process of the production or manufacture, of excisable goods, or any component parts thereof except on land or premises approved for the purpose." So when activities are thought fit to be carried on in the household by a family they can be exempted by Government under these Rules also. Therefore, there is no fear that if activities are *bona fide* carried on in order to preserve standard qualities

by small families, I think, Sir, they are exempted, under this clause as well as under the Rules which Government may think of enforcing. So there is no fear on that account.

Then, Sir, a point was raised about the sewing machines. I do not know who but some hon. Member raised it. He asked why sewing machines were allowed. Sir, sewing machines are allowed because they are used by individual tailors but the hon. Member forgot the suggestion made by the Deputy Finance Minister that the sewing machines are suffering from competition; I mean to say that readymade garments are now allowed to be made by machines to the detriment of the tailoring trade and the small persons, the tailors are suffering from unfair competition on account of the readymade garments machinery which is allowed to be installed. Sir, the latter must bear, in my opinion, some levy as this because we want the garments to be made by the cottage tailor and not by machines which will displace so many tailors and that menace is there just as is the case in *biris*. If the hon. Member had real sympathy for the workers who are in the tailoring trade in the country, which I think his party poses they have, I think, Sir, they will not be missing the point if they say that as regards readymade garments, machines should not be used. It is because they are displacing sewing machines or they are displacing the individual worker, who is using the sewing machine.

Then he has also forgotten embroidery. The House will be surprised to know that a factory is to be started for embroidery work by machines and the machines erected will cost Rs. 28 lakhs. Now I think, Sir, the Deputy Finance Minister has to take note of this as to how many people who are employed at present in embroidery trade, working at home, part-time, will be disengaged by this factory. I think, Sir, Government is not paying attention just as it should in the

matter of arresting the growth of such mechanisation which is not warranted in our country and which will cause a vast displacement of labour which is at present engaged in a trade.

Now, Sir, with regard to the matters which he has raised on account of the competition of cigarettes. It is true, that the *biri* trade is suffering on account of competition from cheap cigarettes, which are being made by big factories, and what are those factories? 75 per cent, of the cigarettes are made by the Imperial Tobacco Company. Now how did it happen? They bought over so many Indian concerns by simply dumping their goods into this country, and they were allowed to dump them and now they are enjoying a monopoly. What I mean to say, Sir, is that a ceiling must be put on their production, that they cannot produce more than a particular quantity. Such should be the case with the Bata Shoe Co. in respect of shoes and Lever Brothers in respect of soap manufacture. There are so many other concerns also which have invaded the field of our cottage industry. I think, Sir, the sooner Government puts a ceiling on their production, that they will not be able to increase production beyond a limit, the better it is for improving the scope of employment in this country. It is no use talking of unemployment or under-employment unless you take definite measure which can provide full employment in the country.

Now, Sir, there is another matter and it is that in these three competitive fields of production it is necessary that Government should demarcate the spheres. I mean to say that they must demarcate the industries, and they must say that this is the field of the cottage industry or the small-scale industry and this field will not be invaded by the large-scale industry. Unless and until we go into the demarcation of the various industries that such and such a sphere is reserved for a certain manufacture, I think

there will be a jumble of industrial production and there will be a vast amount of discontent in labour which will be displaced by mechanisation or mass-scale production. We are not alive to that situation. That situation is slowly operating and if the Government is not alive and if it does not take steps to demarcate the spheres of the industry, we will suffer, Sir, the Government is following an import policy of levying import duty on a scale which may be necessary for indigenous development in the country. While they are thus encouraging indigenous development in the country, they are not demarcating the fields of production of each industry in order that the sphere of one may not be invaded by the other. All the good that is being derived by increasing the import duty will be lost to the country if we did not pay attention to this important factor. This is all the more important because in our national income which is to the extent of Rs. 9,550 crores the contribution which is made by cottage Industry products is Rs. 910 crores, while large-scale industries are giving an income of Rs. 550 crores. So practically the small-scale enterprises carried on on a household scale account for almost double the income from the large industries. If we look at the question from this view, the importance is all the greater. We should see that the industries are put in their proper spheres on a sound basis.

Lastly, I will have to say something with regard to the labour which is employed in this cottage-scale industry. Sir, arguments have been advanced by Mr. Sinha or Mr. Kishen Chand that this labour is being exploited by the middlemen. It is true that this labour is working on starvation wages. They sometimes work for four annas a day for work which may extend to five or six hours. What is the reason? The reason is there are middlemen operating in this field and owing to competition they only resort to reduce the wages given to these labourers. In the case of the

[Shri C. P. Parikh.] *biri* industry, all the raw materials are supplied by them—tobacco leaves, thread and all those things. The labourers simply get labour or the middlemen exploit them both in purchasing the raw materials and in selling the finished goods. There is no organisation to support these labourers who are engaged in a legitimate activity. Now, I will suggest to the Deputy Finance Minister that co-operatives may not be very helpful. It may take five or ten years for them to get established, but are we to wait for a period of five years till the co-operatives gain strength? What we should do should be on a village level or on the National Extension Scheme area level. We should develop a financial organisation which can lend money, which can provide finance or supply raw materials to these people. The finished goods may be taken back from them and sold through State Emporia. We must establish such retail shops through which we can sell these goods so that the profits of middlemen can be eliminated. Wherever this organisation works efficiently, co-operatives will develop by themselves and at that time the Government can go out of the picture. It is no use arguing that you can have co-operatives in small villages but we must consider who is going to help them. I think it is the duty of the State to give the lead to them and help them, if the Government really wants to help them. It is no use saying that we will be covering the country in five years by establishing co-operatives. Are we really giving help to those who need it? We are not. Sir, in our country with its mixed economy we have to provide finances to these people. And these middlemen who are now working with big margins will themselves after the State comes in, work with lower margins. Today they are making these profits but if the State takes upon itself this responsibility of helping these people with reasonable finance and other measures, the profits of the middlemen will be eliminated.

In this connection, I think our banking system has to be changed. It only helps those who have money and who are engaged in trade, commerce and industry. Is the agriculturist helped in any way? Is there any help given to the small-scale industries? I think, Sir, our banking system has neglected them. What is happening?

Deposits are drained off from the rural areas and loans are advanced to the people in the cities. That is the position today. They are destroying the villages and building the cities. We may build the cities but we must not destroy the villages. We must make the villages attractive enough where people will like to live and not leave the villages. These people who are working in the cottage industries are suffering only from want of capital. They have got technical skill. They can produce products which can be sold even in foreign markets under competitive conditions only if there can be this elimination of the middlemen. I know many household articles are being sold in foreign countries at a good price but a huge margin is taken away by the middlemen. In export trade also this has to be done; if the *biri* export industry is to be maintained in foreign countries where we are now losing our hold, the Government should establish a commercial agencies department which should assist the promotion of sales in foreign countries. Then we will be able to make a great progress. There must be a link between the producer and the consumer and that link should be established.

Sir, although this is a small Bill I had to speak on these matters because many important and fundamental principles are involved. They relate to certain constitutional rights—the right to work, the right to equal opportunities for those who have got intelligence and skill to work. With these words, Sir, I support the Bill.

**श्री रत्नलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय**  
(मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं

इस बिल का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। जिस प्रदेश से मैं आया हूँ, उस प्रदेश में बीड़ी का उद्योग बहुत अधिक होता है और बहुत अधिक जनता का पालन-पोषण इस उद्योग से होता है।

पहले मैं थोड़ा इस उद्योग के इतिहास में जाना चाहूँगा कि केन्द्र ने यह ड्यूटी किस तरह लगाई। पिछले चुनावों के बाद जब बीड़ी के बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपति या तो टिकट न मिलने के कारण या इलैक्शन में हार जाने के कारण, मेम्बर न चुने जा सके क्योंकि उनके मजदूरों ने उन्हें वोट नहीं दिये तो उनके दिल में बदले की भावना पैदा हुई। मैं दूसरी जगहों की बात तो नहीं जानता हूँ किन्तु हमारे यहां उनके दिल में एक बदले की भावना पैदा हुई और उसी भावना से यह मशीन की बात शुरू हुई और कुछ मशीनों से बीड़ी बनाना भी उन लोगों ने शुरू किया। जब मशीन द्वारा बीड़ी बनाई जाने लगी तो इस उद्योग में लगे हुए मजदूरों में सनसनी फैल गई और उन्होंने मशीन के विरुद्ध बड़े जोर का विरोध प्रगट किया। मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि चार पांच मशीनों द्वारा बीड़ी बनाना शुरू होते ही सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित हुआ और उसने एक आर्डिनंस द्वारा बीड़ी पर कड़ी ड्यूटी लगा कर मशीन का प्रयोग बन्द कर दिया और जो बीड़ियाँ मशीन द्वारा बनाई गई थीं उन पर भी टैक्स लगा दिया। मैं यह विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ और गवर्नमेंट को बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि जितनी खुशी गवर्नमेंट की इस कार्यवाही से मजदूरों को हुई, जो राहत उनको मिली, जितनी खुशी उन लोगों ने इस आर्डिनंस के लागू किये जाने पर मनाई उसको बतलाने के

लिए मेरे पास शब्द नहीं हैं। जिस तरह से लोग दीवाली में खुशी मनाते हैं उसी तरह से इन उद्योगों में लगे मजदूरों ने आर्डिनंस के जारी होने पर मनाई क्योंकि मशीन द्वारा बीड़ी बनाए जाने पर उनके सिरों पर एक तरह की तलवार लटकने लगी थी, एक बड़ा तहलका सा मच गया था उससे उन्हें निजात मिली।

यह बताने की जरूरत नहीं है कि इस उद्योग में ऐसे लोग भी शामिल हैं जो मध्यम दर्जे के हैं। जो मध्यम दर्जे के पहले रहे हैं और जिनके पास आज कोई कारोबार न रहने से भूखों मरने की नौबत आ गई है, ऐसे कुटुम्बों की हमारे यहां कमी नहीं है। इस बीड़ी के उद्योग ने खास तौर से मध्य प्रदेश में हजारों लाखों की तादाद में लोगों की रक्षा की है, दुर्दिनों के वक्त लोगों का लालन-पालन किया है और आज भी कर रहा है। ऐसे कुटुम्ब जो पहले अच्छे रहे हैं मगर किसी कारण से अब बिगड़ गए हैं, उनमें भी यह उद्योग बड़े जोरों से फँसा हुआ है और उनकी परवरिश हो रही है। मुझे ऐसे घर मालूम हैं जिनमें स्त्रियाँ हजारों की तादाद में पदों में रहती हैं और इस उद्योग को करती हैं। खास तौर से मुसलमान बहनें जो ज्यादातर पदों में रहती हैं, उनके लिए तो यह एक बड़ा भारी आधार साबित हुआ। इस प्रकार जो बहनें बाहर निकल कर काम नहीं कर सकतीं वे बीड़ी बना कर घर की आमदनी बढ़ाती हैं, घर का खर्च चलाती हैं और अपने गरीब खाविन्द की मदद करती हैं। ऐसी औरतें जो बेवा हैं, ऐसी औरतें जिनके पास पूरा काम नहीं है या जो खतों पर काम करती हैं, वे स्पेयर टाइम में, फालतू वक्त में, यह

[श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय]  
काम किया करते हैं और अपनी आमदनी  
बढ़ाती है।

मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि अकेले  
मध्य प्रदेश में देश भर की करीब एक  
तिहाई बड़ी बनती है, बल्कि एक तिहाई  
से ज्यादा बनती है। मध्य प्रदेश में  
करीब २६ करोड़ ५० को बीड़ी एक  
साल में बनती है। एक्साइज में भी इस  
उद्योग से गवर्नमेंट को करीब-करीब २  
करोड़ ५० को आमदनी होती है।

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE  
(SHRI A. C. GUHA) : Two crores of rupees from  
which?

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA:  
On *bidi* tobacco.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: The amount is much more  
than two crores.

SHRI RATANLAL KISHORILAL MALVIYA:  
I have in mind Madhya Pradesh only.

जहाँ तक इस उद्योग का ताल्लुक है  
गवर्नमेंट ने जो कदम उठाया, जो मशीनों  
से बीड़ी का बनाना बन्द किया, वह  
बड़ा सराहनीय कदम है और उसकी मैं  
सराहना करता हूँ।

मेरे कुछ दोस्तों ने मशीनों के पक्ष  
में भाषण दिए और एक दोस्त ने  
कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बनाने की सलाह  
दी। जहाँ तक सिद्धांत की बात है, आज  
में उसके ऊपर बोलने नहीं खड़ा हुआ हूँ।  
मगर मैं आगाह जरूर कर देना चाहता  
हूँ कि जो दोस्त मशीनों के पक्ष में  
बोलते हैं, वे खास तौर से बीड़ी उद्योग  
के मजदूर को नहीं समझे हैं, उसकी  
दिवकत को नहीं समझे हैं, उसकी स्थिति  
को नहीं समझे हैं। इसलिए वे मशीनों

के पक्ष में या कोआपरेटिव के पक्ष में  
बोले हैं।

कोआपरेटिव एक बड़ी अच्छी चीज है  
मैं भी उनका ताईद करता हूँ और यह  
समझता हूँ कि देश का उद्धार कोआपरेटिव  
सिस्टम पर ही हो सकता है। मगर  
जहाँ तक बीड़ी के उद्योग का ताल्लुक है,  
महोदय, मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि  
कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीयाँ काफी काम  
कं गयीं और कोशिश की गई कि  
बीड़ी का उद्योग उन सोसाइटीयाँ के  
द्वारा हो। यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है  
कि इन सोसाइटीयाँ के पास पूंजी न  
होने की वजह से वे कम्पैटिशन न कर  
सकीं और जो बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपति हैं  
उनके मुकाबले में उनकी बीड़ी न चल सकीं।  
इसलिए ये कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीयाँ  
या तो दूसरों के साथ शामिल हो गयीं  
या खत्म कर दी गयीं। सबब यह है  
कि कुछ दिन से बीड़ी के उद्योग में  
बड़ा कम्पैटिशन चालू हुआ है। खास तौर से  
पाकिस्तान के बन जाने के बाद बीड़ी के  
उद्योग में और बीड़ी के निर्यात में बहुत  
कमी हो गई है क्योंकि पहले बीड़ी बहुत  
ज्यादा तादाद में पाकिस्तान के एरिया  
में जाती थी और अब वह कम हो गई  
है इस कमी की वजह से यहाँ के बहुत  
से मजदूर बेकार हो गए और यह उद्योग  
पनप नहीं रहा है। इसलिए जो बड़े-  
बड़े एम्प्लायर्स हैं, बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपति हैं  
वे इस देश में ही लाखों रुपया साल में  
बीड़ी के एडवर्टिजमेंट और प्रचार पर खर्च  
करते हैं तब उनकी बीड़ी चलती है।  
वैसे कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटी बहुत अच्छी  
चीज है और मैं चाहूँगा कि यह योजना  
सफल हो। मगर कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीयाँ  
इस वक्त नहीं पनप सकतीं। मुझे आश्चर्य

मालूम होता है जब मेरे दोस्त यह बतलाते हैं कि कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटियाँ ब्रीडों की मशीनें लगा सकती हैं। मगर उससे हमारी समस्या का हल नहीं होता। मशीन चाहे कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटी लगाये, चाहे कोई एम्प्लायर लगाए, चाहे कोई व्यक्ति लगाए, मशीन के लग जाने के बाद तो एम्प्लाइमेंट में कमी होगी ही, जैसाकि ख्याल किया जाता है और जैसाकि ऐस्टीमेट लगाया गया है और हमें बताया गया कि मशीन के लग जाने के बाद १२ मजदूरों का काम एक मजदूर करेगा। ऐसी हालत में जहां अकेले मध्य प्रदेश में ८ लाख कूटुम्बों की परिवारिक इस ब्रीडी के उद्योग से होती है, वहां ६ लाख से भी अधिक कूटुम्बों के लोग बेकार हो जायेंगे और एक बड़ी भारी समस्या हमारे सामने खड़ी हो जायगी। तो मशीन चाहे कोआपरेटिव की तरफ से हो, चाहे किसी एम्प्लायर की तरफ से हो, चाहे किसी बड़े पूंजीपति की तरफ से हो, मशीन का लगाना हर हालत में इस उद्योग के लिए खतरनाक है।

मैं अपने मित्र मिस्टर पारिख को धन्यवाद देता हूँ। आज इस सभा में उन्होंने अपना एक ऐसा दृष्टिकोण पेश किया जो कि उनकी स्थिति के आदमी से हम उम्मीद नहीं करते थे। इस बेकारी की समस्या को ले कर उन्होंने एक रास्ता सुझाया है कि किस तरह से इस बेकारी का हल हो सकता है और किस तरह से छोटे-छोटे उद्योग धंधों का प्रोटेक्शन करना चाहिये।

गवर्नमेंट ने यह कदम देहान्त जनता की रक्षा के लिए उठाया है क्योंकि देहात में ब्रीडी बनाने वाली जनता ज्यादा है

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह भी सुझाव पेश करना चाहता हूँ कि इसी तरह से चावल की मशीनों पर भी कंट्रोल किया जाये। आज इतनी ज्यादा तादाद में चावल की मशीनें बढ़ गई हैं कि इंडीरियर से इंडीरियर देहात में ये मशीनें चलती हैं। इससे बहुत आदमी, बहुत हरबाहे और किसान बिल्कुल बेकार हो गये हैं।

**श्री कन्हैयालाल डी० बंस :** चावल भी खराब हो जाता है।

**श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय :** चावल तो खराब होता ही है क्योंकि चावल उबाला जाता है और दूसरे जो उसका प्रासेस है उससे उसके विटामिन मारे जाते हैं। इसलिए एक तो चावल की क्वालिटी खराब हो जाती है और दूसरे इन मशीनों की वजह से लाखों आदमी बेकार हो जाते हैं। इसलिए इस उद्योग के बारे में भी हमें इंडस्ट्रीज (डिवेलपमेंट ऐंड रेग्युलेशन) ऐक्ट का इस्तेमाल करना चाहिये। गवर्नमेंट कम से कम इन मशीनों का कंट्रोल करे ताकि इनका ताता न फैलने पाए। मुझे देहात में ज्यादा रहना पड़ता है और मैं वहां के रहने वालों की मुसीबतें जानता हूँ। अगर कोई बड़ा किसान होता है और उसको मजदूर मिलने में अड़चन होती है या कोई मजदूर एक आधा घंटा देरी से आता है या मजदूरी ज्यादा मांगता है तो वह बड़ा किसान सिर्फ यही धमकी देता है कि वह यह चावल मशीन पर ले जायेगा। यह धमकी उस मजदूर से ज्यादा काम लेने के लिए काफी होती है। ऐसी हालत में मैं जरूर अर्ज करूंगा कि दूसरे उद्योगों के साथ, जिनका उल्लेख हमारे भाई पारिख जी ने किया है, चूंकि खास तौर से यह सीधा देहात से ताल्लुक



[श्री रतनलाल किशोरीलाल मालवीय]  
रखने वाला मसला है, चावल की मशीनों को अगर बिल्कुल बन्द नहीं किया जा सकता तो कम से कम उन पर कंट्रोल जरूर किया जाये।

अब एक बात मैं गवर्नमेंट से समझना चाहूंगा। श्री पारिख के भाषण से ऐसा मालूम होता है कि जो एक्साइज ड्यूटी लगाई गई है वह एक्सपोर्ट करने वाली वीड्री पर नहीं है। मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आई क्योंकि यह जो एमंडमेंट है उसका सीधा मतलब यह है कि कोई भी आदमी जो कि मशीन से वीड्री बनायेगा उसको तीन रुपया हजार एक्साइज ड्यूटी देनी पड़ेगी। इस एमंडमेंट का मैं यही मतलब समझता हूँ। यदि इस एमंडमेंट का मतलब ऐसा है, जैसा कि श्री पारिख ने समझाया है कि जो वीड्री बाहर भेजी जाएगी वह अगर मशीन से बनेगी तो उसके ऊपर कोई ड्यूटी नहीं होगी, तो मैं इसका सख्त विरोधी हूँ और मैं गवर्नमेंट से कहूंगा कि वह इसको साफ कर दे। अगर ऐसी बात है कि बाहर जाने वाली वीड्री को मशीन से बताने दिया जायेगा तो मैं चाहूंगा कि वह चीज न हो क्योंकि यह एक खतरनाक कदम होगा। मुझे बहुत दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि छोटी सी छूट देने पर भी जो इम्प्लायर्स हैं, जो पूंजीपति हैं वे ऐसे रास्ते निकाल लेंगे जिससे कि इस ड्यूटी से बच जायेंगे और एक्सपोर्ट के नाम पर अपने देश की खपत के लिए भी मशीनों से वीड्री बना लेंगे और उनको कंट्रोल करना गवर्नमेंट के लिए बहुत मुश्किल हो जायेगा। तो गवर्नमेंट से मैं यह क्लैरिफिकेशन चाहूंगा और अर्ज करूंगा कि अगर मशीन से बनने वाली

एक्सपोर्ट होने वाली वीड्री के ऊपर रोक नहीं है तो यह खतरनाक चीज है और उसके ऊपर भी रोक होनी चाहिये। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का फिर से समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री डी० नारायण (बम्बई) : उप-सभापति महोदय, आप और हम जानते हैं कि जिस विधेयक पर इस वक्त विचार हो रहा है उस विधेयक के लिए गत वर्ष से हम लोग कोशिश करते आ रहे हैं और मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि हमने गत वर्ष प्रथम बार जब यह प्रश्न उठाया था तब से अब तक यहां पर और बाहर जो कुछ हलचल हुई उसी के परिणामस्वरूप यह विधेयक आज आपके सामने पेश है और मैं मंत्री महोदय को इस विधेयक के लिए बधाई देना चाहता हूँ।

इस विधेयक से हम आज एक सिद्धांत कायम करने जा रहे हैं और वह सिद्धांत यह है कि यदि किसी मशीन की वजह से इस मुल्क में बेकारी बढ़ती है तो हम उसको रोके बगैर नहीं रहेंगे। इस सिद्धांत को शब्दों में माना हो या न माना हो परन्तु यह बात साफ है कि इस मशीन के दाखिल हो जाने से बहुत कुछ बेकारी बढ़ जायेगी, बेरोजगारी बढ़ जायेगी और मैं समझता हूँ कि इसी सिद्धांत को सामने रख कर यह विधेयक आज आपके सामने लाया गया है। यदि हमारे देश में यह सिद्धांत जो कि महात्मा गांधी ने रखा था मान लिया जाता है कि यदि किसी किस्म की मशीन मनुष्य को बेकार बनाती है तो उस मशीन को बन्द कर देना चाहिये, तो हम आगे के लिए एक बहुत बड़ा कदम उठाते हैं।

महात्मा गांधी न तो कोई मशीन के विरोधी थे, न उसके पक्षपाती थे। महात्मा गांधी पक्षपाती थे मनुष्य के। वह मनुष्य का पक्षपात करते थे और जहां किसी चीज से मनुष्य को धक्का पहुंचता था वहां उसी चीज का वह विरोध करते थे।

मैं तो कल था नहीं, परन्तु मैंने सुना कि स्यूइंग मशीन की बात कही गई। महात्मा गांधी ने स्यूइंग मशीन का समर्थन किया था क्योंकि स्यूइंग मशीन से कोई बेकारी बढ़ती नहीं थी, परन्तु जहां मशीन से बेकारी बढ़ती है, जहां बेरोजगारी बढ़ती है वहां महात्मा गांधी उसका विरोध करते थे।

तो मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि जिस सिद्धांत को आज मंत्री महोदय ने मान लिया है वह सिद्धांत यदि उन्होंने सिद्धांतरूप से माना होगा तो इस देश की बेकारी दिन ब दिन कम करने के उपाय सोचे जायेंगे और फिर इस तरह से किसी रेशनलाईजेशन का विचार न किया जाएगा कि भले ही मजदूर संख्या घटे लेकिन मशीनें बढ़ें और उत्पादन बढ़े।

एक बात और है। वह यह है कि आपने इस बीड़ी के घरेलू उद्योग को बढ़ाने के लिए और बीड़ी के उद्योग में आज जो ६ लाख मजदूर सारे देश में काम कर रहे हैं उनको बचाने के लिए जो यह कदम रखा है वह ठीक है लेकिन उसके साथ साथ मैं आपको आगाह करना चाहता हूँ कि आगे चल कर इन मजदूरों को आपको सिगरेट्स के कम्पीटीशन से भी बचाना होगा क्योंकि आप देखेंगे कि दिन ब दिन सिगरेट्स की कीमत घटती

जा रही है और बीड़ियों की कीमत बढ़ती जा रही है और नतीजा यह होने को है और वह दिन करीब है जब कि शायद बीड़ी और सिगरेट की कीमत में कोई बहुत फर्क न रहे। इसलिए मैं सरकार को अभी से आगाह करना चाहता हूँ कि आप बीड़ी के इस महान् उद्योग को, इस घरेलू उद्योग को, सिगरेट के कम्पीटीशन से बचावें। उदाहरण के तौर पर लीजिये। बम्बई शहर में रोजाना ५५ लाख सिगरेटें बिकती हैं और ७२ लाख बीड़ियां बिकती हैं परन्तु बीड़ी की कीमत होती है २० हजार रुपये और सिगरेट की कीमत होती है ४ लाख रुपये। बीड़ी ड्योड़ी बिकती है और कीमत २० हजार आती है लेकिन सिगरेट्स ५५ लाख बिकती हैं और कीमत आती है ४ लाख रुपये। इससे आपको पता चलेगा कि किस तरह से बीड़ी के उद्योग को सिगरेट से धक्का पहुंच सकता है। हमें उसे बचाना चाहिये।

तीसरी बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि बीड़ी का उद्योग घरेलू उद्योग तो है परन्तु घरेलू उद्योग होते हुए भी वह अब पूंजीपतियों का उद्योग बनता जा रहा है।

मुझे पता है कि बीड़ी का उद्योग करके इस देश में कई भाई कोटियाधीश बन गए। जिनके पास २५ वर्ष पहले मूधिकल से २५ हजार की पूंजी नहीं थी, इसी उद्योग के जरिये आज उनके पास पचास-पचास लाख की पूंजी मौजूद है, और आज उनके कारखानों में पांच-पांच हजार, सात-सात हजार बीड़ी बनाने वाले मजदूर काम करते हैं। इससे क्या नतीजा हुआ, वह मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ। मिनिमम वेजिज एक्ट के अनुसार

[श्री डी० नारायण]

आज बम्बई स्टेट में यह तय हुआ है कि एक हजार ब्रीडी के पीछे मजदूर को दो रुपये मजदूरी दी जाय। यदि मेरी मालूमत ठीक है—और मैं जानता हूँ कि वह ठीक हो सकती है—तो मध्य प्रदेश में हजार के पीछे दस आने मजदूरी दी जाती है। बम्बई स्टेट में हजार के पीछे दो रुपया दी जाती है, तो बंगल के पास के स्टेट में वही मजदूरी दस आने दी जाती है। मध्य भारत में वह सवा रुपया है। नतीजा यह हुआ है कि ये जो हमारे बम्बई के पूंजीपति हैं, वे बम्बई में अपने कारखानों को बन्द करके उन्हें मध्य प्रदेश में ले जा रहे हैं, क्योंकि मजदूरी कम देनी पड़ती है और नफा ज्यादा रहता है। इसलिए सरकार से मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि सारे देश के लिए करीब-करीब एक सी मजदूरी निश्चित कर देनी चाहिये। जिस तरह से बम्बई राज्य के लिए मजदूरी दो रुपये निश्चित कर दी गई है, उसी तरह से मध्य प्रदेश के लिए, मध्य भारत के लिए, हैदराबाद के लिए और जहां जहां ये ब्रीडियां अधिक बनती हैं वहां वहां, ये रेट एक से कर दिये जाने चाहिये, नहीं तो इस से मजदूरों को बहुत अधिक नुकसान पहुंचेगा। आप तो कहते हैं कि मशीन की वजह से मजदूर बेकार हो रहे थे। अब अगर ये पूंजीपति एक जगह से उठ कर दूसरे प्रांत में चले जायेंगे तो उस जगह के बेचारे मजदूर जरूर ही बेकार हो जायेंगे। इसलिए बेकारी सिर्फ मशीन की वजह से ही बढ़ने वाली नहीं, यह मैंने दूसरा कारण भी बताया है जिससे वह बेकारी बढ़ेगी। इसलिए आपसे प्रार्थना है कि मिनिमम बेजिज एक्ट के अनुसार सब प्रांतों के लिए मजदूरी एक सी हो

और सब जगह मजदूरी एक सी कर दी जाय।

इसके बाद मुझे आपसे इस विषय में बहुत कुछ कहना नहीं है कि बरेलू उद्योगों के बारे में हमें क्या करना चाहिए। बहुत से ऐसे उद्योग हैं जिनकी यहां चर्चा की जा सकती है, परन्तु मैं यह मौका नहीं समझता कि उसकी चर्चा की जाये। सरकार ने एक तरह से इस सिद्धांत को मान लिया है कि इस मशीन के उपयोग से बेकारी बढ़ने वाले हैं भले ही उसने इस बिल के स्टेटमेंट आफ आब्जेक्ट्स एण्ड रीजंस में इस बात को मंजूर नहीं किया है कि इसी को रोकने के लिए इस विधेयक को रख रहे हैं। सब कोई जानते हैं कि दिन ब दिन इस मुल्क में दुर्भाग्य से बेकारी बढ़ रही है। आपने आज के अखबार पढ़े होंगे। सौराष्ट्र असेम्बली में यह सवाल पूछा गया कि १९५३-५४ में बेकारी की वजह से कितनी आत्महत्याएं हुईं? जवाब मिला, सात। बेकारी की वजह से सात मनुष्यों ने आत्महत्या की। कुछ दिन हुए बम्बई असेम्बली में सवाल पूछा गया था कि बेकारी की वजह से कितनी आत्महत्याएं हुईं? जवाब दिया गया, २९। आज ही अखबारों में आपने यह भी पढ़ा होगा कि गुड़गांव में बेकारी की वजह से एक हरिजन कुटुम्ब ने आत्महत्या कर ली यानी दिन ब दिन यह बेकारी बढ़ती जा रही है और उद्योगों की कमी है। तो हमारे सामने सवाल यह है कि किस तरह से हम अपने मजदूर भाइयों को उद्योग दिला सकते हैं और किस तरह से वे उद्योग के जरिये से अपना पेट भर सकते हैं। जब इस सवाल को आप सोचेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि इस देश में बरेलू उद्योगों के प्रचार की

कितनी आवश्यकता है, कहां मशीना का हमें कम करना होगा, कहां मशीनों को हमें रहने देना होगा ? इसका पता आप को तब चलेगा जब आप हर एक मनुष्य को उद्योग देकर जिलाने की कोई तरकीब निकाल कर उस जिम्मेदारी को अपने सिर पर लेंगे। सरकार को यह जिम्मेदारी ले लेनी चाहिये। सरकार का अस्तित्व तभी अभीष्ट माना जा सकता है जब कि सरकार हर एक को उद्योग देने की जिम्मेदारी अपने सिर पर ले। जब तक सरकार यह जिम्मेदारी नहीं लेती है तब तक हम एक धोके में हैं, एक महान् संकट में हैं—ऐसा हमें मान लेना चाहिये। और इस लिहाज से मैं जानता हूँ कि यह कदम एक ऐसा कदम है जिससे हम मालूम कर सकते हैं कि सरकार इस धोके से बचना चाहती है और इस धोके को बंद रोकना चाहती है। सरकार उस ओर आगे बढ़ना चाहती है, ऐसा मैं मानता हूँ और मेरी यह धारणा है। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि आप मशीनों का विरोध करें, मैं यह भी नहीं कहता कि आप मशीनों का मौके बे मौके समर्थन करें। आप भी कुछ न करें बल्कि आप कृपा करके मनुष्य का पक्ष लें और मनुष्य को उद्योग दें, मनुष्य को जिंदा रखें और स्वाभिमान के साथ जिंदा रखें,

(टाइम बेल)

उसे आप प्रतिष्ठा के साथ जीवित रहने दें। इतना आप करने की कृपा करें, यही मेरी आपसे अपेक्षा है।

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Travancore-Cochin):  
Sir, I would like to touch on a few of the points raised by the hon. the Deputy Minister for Finance yesterday. One of the points he made was that this Bill was being introduced solely in the interests of the -workers. At the same time, he said

⌘ R.S.D.

that it was introduced, if not to prohibit, at least to discourage the introduction of machinery into the biri industry, and that that was the reason why this heavy excise duty was sought to be imposed on machine-made biris. Sir, I am in a way connected with biri labour. I have on several occasions had the opportunity of studying the working as well as the living conditions of the biri workers. I have also had the opportunity of studying the report submitted by Mr. Rege. In the light of all these things, what I would like to submit is that the assumption which the Minister made yesterday in the course of his speech was not solely correct. I doubt whether the imposition of this duty of Rs. 3 per thousand biris produced by machines will be enough to discourage further introduction of machinery into this industry. A machine can make an enormous amount of profit by competing with hand-made biris. The Minister himself has given figures to show that a machine can produce 1,500 biris an hour, while a man can make only 125 biris an hour. Let us assume this to be correct. Since the factory owners are successfully circumventing the Factories Act, most of the factory labour is compelled to work 8 or 10 hours a day, because they get attracted to the myth of more wages. Even if we take that a machine works for nine hours a day, it can produce 13,000 biris a day, i.e., ten times what a man can produce by hand. That means it does the work of ten workers. I do not know the technique of these machines; that is a drawback in my speech. But if these machines are composite ones, i.e., if one machine cuts the leaves, mixes the tobacco, rolls the leaves and ties them round as biris, then one machine will require only one worker (operator).

4 P.M.

Suppose he is being paid Rs. 2 to produce 13,000 biris a day. What would be the result? Let us see. In our place there are three varieties of biris being produced small, medium and large size biris. There are lakhs of workers engaged in this industry. One average worker produces per working

[Shri N. C. Sekhar.] day 9 hours with the help of a helper boy about 2,200 small-size *biris*. If it is medium-size, he produces 1,200 and if it is big size he produces 1,000 in nine hours. The cost of production for the small size in our part comes, including the price of tobacco, leaf and the wages of the workers to Rs. 4/4 which includes the wage of Rs. 1/6 per 1,000 and if it is medium-size the worker gets Rs. 1/10 per thousand. The small-size biri is sold in the market—wholesale price—at Rs. 5 per thousand. This is the price (wholesale) the factory owner gets. For medium size *biris* he gets Rs. 8 per thousand and bigger size is sold at Rs. 10. Our officers or Ministers may not believe that but it is our own experience. You go to Palghat which is a *biri* producing centre where 5,000 to 6,000 workers are engaged by about 15 factories. In Cannanore and Mangalore also you can find thousands of workers engaged in the production of *biris*. So if the biri-owner sells the small-size *biris* produced by 10 workers, he gets Rs. 17/8 as net profit. The medium size fetches him Rs. 35 per 10,000 as profit and for big-size *biris* he gets Rs. 50. If you refer to the Rege report, you will find similar figures. These are figures which we get every year for the workers to fight for their bonus and increments. No *biri* factory, owner can gainsay this fact. If 10 workers can produce this much of profit for the ordinary factory owner or for a middleman, surely the machine which has the capacity of 10 workers' production should be able to give more. That means the owner economises 9 labourers' wages. So he gets more profit by the machine. I don't know what sort of biri the machine produces but I think it will be either medium or big-sized. Then on a big-size biri he can get Rs. 50 per ten thousand and certainly it is no loss for him to pay Rs. 3 as excise duty. So also in case of medium-size *biris*. When it is compared with the profit of a factory-owner having men working, certainly the machine owner is not in any difficulty by having to pay this excise duty. Neither is the Government going to prohibit further intro-

duction of machines nor is the owner who produces this biri by machine going to be discouraged by this Bill. What is going to happen is this. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons the hon. Minister himself has stated that it is with a view to obtaining for the State the advantage gained in biri manufacture by machines by the considerable lowering of the cost of production. Anyway by the introduction of machine in the *biri* industry, it is going to gain much. Then, why should the owner alone be allowed to gain and why not also the Government? The industrial policy of the Government is reflected throughout the taxation system. So, what Government has done is in the name of protecting labour and home industry, they are going to gain some revenue rather than protecting the workers. If the Government really intends to protect the workers who are already engaged in the industry from their being thrown out, what they should have done was to prohibit the introduction of machines *in tota*. At least the Government should have increased the excise duty to Rs. 10. If at least that had been done, then one could believe what the hon. Minister said but this will act contrary to what the hon. Minister has said.

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, in this very short Bill so many other matters have been introduced. I think some of them are quite relevant to the issue. Many hon. Members or almost all of them have touched on cottage industries as such. I can assure the hon. Members that this Bill is not an isolated or sporadic act on the part of the Government unconnected with any general policy. Sir, I would like to remind the Rajya Sabha of what has been stated in the Constitution as a Directive Principle in article 43 which says:

"The State shall endeavour to secure, by suitable legislation or economic organisation or in any other way, to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise, work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full enjoyment of leisure and

social and cultural opportunities and, in particular, the State shall endeavour to promote cottage industries on an individual or cooperative basis in rural areas."

This has been embodied in our Constitution and it is one of the Directive Principles to direct the activities of the Government. Moreover during the last year or two, on many occasions Government has come before Parliament for the approval and sanction of Parliament of similar measures. Sir, I think the Sabha will recollect that a restriction was imposed on the production of dhoties and saris in the cotton mills. That was simply to help the handloom industry. Subsequently, a special cess was put on mill products of textiles and the annual revenue collected is nearly Rs. 6 crores. That amount is intended to help the handloom industry. Large sums of money are being given as loans and grants to co-operatives running handloom industry and also a rebate is given out of this fund for any purchase of handloom products.

Similarly, Sir, for Khadi also Government has arranged for the payment of a rather higher rate of rebate. And then, as we all know, in the last Budget, certain excise duties were imposed. I think hon. Members will recollect that those duties were imposed mainly and in some cases solely on larger units of production, larger units producing footwear, or soap or art silk, only have been made liable to the new excise duty. And the smaller units which may be called the cottage industry scale units, have been exempted from the excise duty. That excise duty has been put in the last Budget on the bigger production units of footwear, soap and art silk. That is also an indication of the Government's policy as regards these cottage industries.

Then again, Government have also set up so many boards and committees for the protection and encouragement of cottage industries, like the All-India Handloom Board, the All-India Khadi and Village Industries

Board and the Handicraft Board. All these bodies have been set up recently with the particular intention of encouraging our rural industries.

There was also a survey made of small industries by the International Planning Team of the Ford Foundation and this team made certain recommendations to the Government and the Government has promptly reacted to those recommendations. Government in their Resolution dated the 7th June, 1954 have indicated how some of those recommendations are being implemented. I may mention some of the items. There is the setting up of small industries' corporations to organise production for meeting Government orders. Then, there is the establishment of a marketing service corporation which would integrate the activities of different institutes. The establishment of four regional institutes of technology for small industries is also there. And there is also a scheme for the appointment of a Director and Small-scale Industries Board. The function of this Director and of this Board will be to integrate and regulate the activities of the small-scale industries.

Therefore, I hope hon. Members will see that this measure which I have the pleasure to pilot here is only just a part of the general policy of the Government.

Some hon. Members have referred to the oil mills and rice mills and here an hon. Member is whispering something about the match industry, particularly Wimco. As regards the oil mills, this industry is in the schedule of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act and since the passing of that Act, that is to say, since 8th May 1952 no fresh licence for oil mills has been given and it is the definite policy of the Government to encourage the village *ghanis*. A committee has also been set up to consider ways and means of helping and developing the village *ghani* industry. As for rice mills, the Planning Commission some time ago made recommendations to encourage hand-pounding of rice and I think Government is contemplating the

[Shri A. C. Guha.] setting up of a committee—of course that will be done by the Food and Agriculture Ministry and I do not want to anticipate my colleague in that Ministry. But I think Government expects to appoint a committee to inquire into this rice-milling industry also and to see how far hand-pounding can be done and how far hand-pounded rice can replace mill-made rice.

Then, as for the match industry, I think hon. Members know that the excise duty on matches is graded according to the capacity of the unit producing the matches. Very recently, on the intervention of Shri Satish Chandra Das Gupta who can be called, if I may use a strong word, a fanatic as regards rural and cottage industries.

AN HON. MEMBER: You use it in a good sense?

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Yes, I use it in a good sense and I entertain high regard for him. On his intervention, Government have agreed to create a new category under which a match industry unit producing only 25 gross a day will get a rebate of 6 annas per gross, and the excise duty collected on matches is thus graded. So I say it is the policy of the Government to give more and more encouragement to these small-scale and cottage industries. And therefore, whatever misgivings hon. Members, who have supported this Bill or who may have opposed it as well may have about the general policy of the Government, I can assure them that it is the definite policy of the Government to encourage cottage industries, the rural industries and the small-scale industries.

We all know, Sir, that for the present, if not the main, at least one of the main problems before the Government is the unemployment problem and I think all hon. Members have received some papers circulated by the Government, a sort of a report submitted by some Indian engineers about China and how she has been executing some of her river-valley schemes through manual labour. Government has since

examined that report and has been, favourably impressed with the method by which China has been doing these things. That is also an indication to give some incentive for manual labour so that a larger number of people may be employed. Sir, in Europe labour is rather costly and it is not even sufficient in number also. But in our country labour is not costly, at least we have got abundance of labour. So our problem is not so much to have labour-saving devices as to give employment to millions of people who have not got enough employment.

Mention was also made of Mahatma-Gandhi's ideology in this matter. One friend correctly interpreted it when he said that Gandhiji was neither opposed to machines nor in favour of machines, but he was only in favour of man. It was the dignity of man that he was safeguarding. Man should not become the slave of machine and if man could be the master of the machine, Gandhiji would never object to it. Some friend referred to the sewing machine. I think Mahatma Gandhi was eloquent in praising the Singer Sewing machine. It is a labour-saving machine. It saves the labour of our womenfolk, our daughters and mothers. Particularly, the origin of the Singer Sewing machine interested Mahatma Gandhi very much. It was out of his love for his wife, in order to save her from the drudgery of having to do so much of manual work that made Singer invent that machine. Mahatma Gandhi described the machine as having its origin in love. It is not true to say that he was opposed to machines; surely he was opposed to machines when they became masters of men, to create unemployment for men and to produce starvation and hunger for men. When we have brought this Bill we have kept that ideology in our mind—Some friends have referred to export. I think those friends have also mentioned that Pakistan has practically closed its export market and I do not think that Pakistan will oblige us by re-opening that market to

us. The only market of considerable worth is the Ceylon market. In this connection of excise duty, I should make one point clear and that is, this duty is not going to affect the export market. I should also like to dispel any misgivings in the mind of my hon. friend Mr. Malviya. If machines can produce *biris* simply for export, that will not affect the labour employed in the *biri* industry at present. He need not be afraid that these industrialists or capitalists will find so many ways to escape this payment and give the machine manufactured *biris* for home consumption. Sir, this apprehension of his is apparently born out of his ignorance about the collection of excise duty. Whenever an excisable article is produced and is released from the factory, immediately the excise duty is collected. If a portion of it is later on exported then only the rebate is given. That is done also in the case of sugar, in the case of textiles and in the case of any other article. Whenever the product is allowed to come out of the factory, the excise duty is collected and subsequently if an exporter or a shipper can get an order from outside he will get the rebate of the amount of excise duty collected thereon. There is hardly any scope for evasion but, Sir, in spite of so many penal codes and criminal procedure codes today, there may be some offences against the laws all over the world and we should consider whether we should take that risk in consideration of creating some more employment for some people and also for creating foreign markets for our tobacco and *biris*. From Pakistan we were getting about two crores of rupees; apart from the excise duty collected on the tobacco used for the *biris*, this two crores of rupees was coming to our balance of trade. If the machine-manufactured *biris* can open up new markets outside India, that is not going to harm the employees now employed but will open up some more avenues for employing more people and also get some more export markets for India.

I think, Sir, I have touched almost all the points mentioned by hon. Members. I hope the House will now be pleased to return the Bill to the Lok Sabha.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

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

Clauses 2 to 4 were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI A. C. GUHA: Sir, I beg to move.

"That the Bill be returned."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is.

"That the Bill be returned." The

motion was adopted.

#### **THE INDIAN TARIFF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1954**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill, 1954. This is a Money Bill and I have to announce that under Rule 162(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, the Chairman has allotted one and a half hours for the completion of all stages involved in the consideration and return of the Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill by the Rajya Sabha, including the consideration and passing of amendments, if any, to the Bill.

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE: (SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, as passed'