

the Indian Coconut Committee (Amendment) Act, 1952, the Members of this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct, one Member from among themselves to be a member of the Indian Central Coconut Committee."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA) :
 Sir, I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of clause (s) of section 4 of the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee Act, 1946, as amended by the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee (Amendment) Act, 1952, the Members of this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may direct two Members from among themselves to" be members of the Indian Central Oilseeds Committee."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA):
 Sir, I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of paragraph 3 of the late Department of Education, Health & Lands Resolution No. F. 40-26/44-A, dated the 10th April, 1945, the Members of this Council do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Chairman may prescribe, one Member from among themselves to be a member of the Indian Central Tobacco Committee."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform hon. Members that the following dates have been fixed for nominations and for holding elections, if necessary, to the following Committees:—

The National Food & Agriculture Organisation Liaison Committee—

Last date for receiving nomination—17th April 1953.

Date of election—21st April 1953.

The Indian Central Coconut Committee—

Last date for receiving nominations—17th April 1953.

Date of election—21st April 1953.

The Indian Central Oilseeds Committee—

Last date for receiving nominations—13th April 1953.

Date of election—22nd April 1953.

The Indian Central Tobacco Committee—

Last date for receiving nominations—18th April 1953.

Date of election—22nd April 1953.

The nominations for these Committees will be received in the Council Notice Office upto 12 Noon on the dates mentioned for the purpose. The elections which will be conducted in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, will be held in Secretary's Room—No; 29—in Parliament House, ground floor, between the hours of 10 A.M. and 1 P.M. on those dates.

THE KHADI AND OTHER HAND- LOOM INDUSTRIES DEVELOP- MENT (ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTY ON CLOTH) BILL, 1953.

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI) :

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of an additional duty of excise on cloth for raising funds for the purpose of developing khadi and other handloom industries and for promoting the sale of khadi and other handloom cloth, as passed, by the House of the People¹, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the central provision in this measure is the le"" it an excise duty of three pies per yard of cloth produced by textile mills in order to create a fund for the purposes mentioned by me just now. Sir, on this question there is likely to be some difference

^Shri T. T. Krishnarnachari.]

of opinion among the hon. Members of this House. Firstly, some hon. Members would think that the levy of three pies per yard of cloth would be a burden on the textile industry and this method of levying a cess or excise duty on one industry to support the weaker industries in the same field should not be pursued. Sir, whether the burden would be heavy or not, is a matter of opinion. The Government feels convinced that a levy of three pies excise duty would not constitute a burden certainly on the industry. It is true that it is a burden on the consumer as ultimately all these excise duties are passed on to the consumer. But it might be resented. Sir, by those people who are conversant with the textile industry and in whose case it is not always possible to pass on these duties. Another type of criticism might be that this blanket excise duty of three pies per yard on cloth—whether it is a cheap cloth made of coarse and medium yarn or whether it is a fine or superfine cloth—is not very wise. Secondly, the question might be that it is not wise to levy the same amount of duty on the mill-made cloth, irrespective of whether it is 70 inches wide or 90 inches wide. Well, I recognise, Sir, there must be some force in this type of criticism. But we intend this measure to be more or less a permanent part of our taxation structure. This is a very important aspect in the levy of excise duty, I believe, and it may be that other duties may disappear. We have got to be very simple. If we do not levy the other types of excise duties, we cannot have a large staff for the purpose of levying this very small excise duty. So, while it does look something not very logical as the excise duty is practically negligible, we rather emphasise on the administrative convenience of having one type of duty on all types of cloth, irrespective of the quality of the cloth. Sir, as regards the question of incidence on the consumer, the Government feels that there are a number of factors which go to make up a situation before the law of diminishing returns operates.

In the matter of consumption of cloth, the Government feels convinced that this factor, namely the levying of a three pies per yard excise duty, is almost a negligible factor. Sir, so far as the excise duty is concerned, that is what I have to say at the present moment.

The question would also arise in regard to the utilisation of this fund and on this, I have no doubt, the hon. Members of this House would have much to say. In the first place, a part of the fund is supposed to be utilised or is intended to be utilised for the promotion of production of Khadi. Sir, on this question of Khadi, I know, many hon. friends who have put their ideas into the field of modern economics may be able to say something which inherently may strengthen the case of Khadi or it might be that hon. Members will say that the Congress Party which has adopted Khadi as its political uniform is trying to buttress a type of industry the roots of which are essentially sentimental and political with no basis in the field of practical economics. Well, I would at once disclaim any such intentions of putting Khadi to political use so far as the utilisation of this cess is concerned. I have said in the other House and I would like to repeat it here that we do consider Khadi as a means to help people who are unemployed or underemployed. It may be, Sir, that it would not cover all cases of unemployment. It may not even cover a fraction of the cases but to the extent that it does cover I think it is good. Well, we may say that after all this is supported only by sentiment. But then sentiment altogether cannot be ruled out. It has a place in other countries and even in U.K. it has a place and people there do wear their country's home-spun and home-woven cloth and I cannot see why Khadi here, apart from its political connections should not remain a part of the sartorial set up of people of this country for all time to come. But it is not so much on the sentiment aspect as on the aspect of employment resulting therefrom that I would like to lay stress and to the extent that we do help

somebody to get 8 annas or 10 annas or even 6 annas a day as his or her wages for spinning yarn—which time perhaps is being wasted by him and is just being put to productive use—to that extent I think it is something achieved.

Then on the question of handloom. hon. Members again would have a lot to say. It is a fact, Sir, that within recent months the position of the handloom industry in this country has undergone changes for the worse. It has also opened our eyes to the fact very definitely that if this industry is to survive it has got to be organized. It is not a question of our taking a defeatist view of the question and say, "well, the industry cannot survive as against mill competition, so let it go". Again, Sir, it is a matter of employment. It is said that there are 28 lakhs of handlooms in the country. It may be that this is not a correct estimate because often times, Sir since the establishment of looms during the last 5 or 6 years, in the process connected with the issue of a quota card for obtaining yarn there is a possibility of the number of looms being multiplied in the same way as the ration cards are multiplied. I do not think that there is anything definitely immoral about it because I suppose hon. Members will admit that it is immoral to the extent that the multiplied ration cards are involved. But the fact remains that there are a very large number of handloom weavers in this country, leave alone about 4 lakhs of looms in Assam which are not put to commercial use but very largely utilised by people for their own clothing purposes. It may be that there are millions of hand-looms in this country. Some handloom weavers—because the type of cloth produced by them is a speciality cloth— even though they find it difficult to survive at the present time in the face of the organized competition of the mills can still live. I will only refer to the sarees that are produced in well-known places, not merely in South India but also in the North. Hon. Members who have experience of buying such sarees for their domestic use would remember

that the Chanderi sarees produced by Madhya Bharat have got a great reputation in India. I mention this as an instance because about some 9 or 10 months back. I think, the industry was suffering for the simple reason that the weaver was accustomed to produce 9 yards sarees only which was essentially used by the Maharashtra people and that was the particular type of saree which they were using and we did not know or could not realize that they were far away from the seat of civilization where the fashions have changed and women have taken to sarees of 5 2 or 6 yards, as the case may be, and it was. I think, very good of the Madhya Bharat Government and the Industries Department to bring this fact to the notice of the weavers, and they with some difficulty changed from the production of 9 yards sarees to 5½ or 6 yards sarees. With the Government Department entering that industry or rather helping that industry, they were also able to produce various designs of the Chanderi sarees and the Tulu sarees. These are only instances to show that even among handloom products these have a special significance, an artistic significance of its own and there is a continuous demand in the market where the price factor would not operate against it. Lack of knowledge of the producer of modern taste and lack of organization make the industry go into loneliness. The intention really is that we should organise the handloom industry in such a manner that it should be able to stand on its own legs, and the money required is for the purpose of organisation, it may be 4 crores or 5 crores; may be more. It is not intended to give them doles. I have a letter from a friend of mine in Tinnevely who is personally interested in the handloom worker. He said, "Co-operative societies are no use; the money has to be distributed to handloom weavers". It is not an unemployment dole and in that sense we do not intend it to be used as such. The idea is that we should organize the industry and that we should supply yarn at steady prices in spite of market fluctuations operating against them. We should take it over from the

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.] unorganized weaver and sell it in those places where there is the demand, besides furnishing the weaver with advice in the matter of designs, assistance in the matter of providing him with facilities for sizing, calendering, dyeing, trimming and so on. Well, it is a very ambitious programme we have in mind. But we propose to limit our activities, to a very large extent, to co-operative societies. It may be, Sir hon. Members here who have experience of co-operation may say. "Well, co-operation in the credit field has failed, co-operation in the multipurpose field has failed, co-operation in the distribution field has failed." It might be all true. But every failure in this field of co-operation has only to strengthen us in the belief that if we organize properly we might be able to get a move on and establish it firmly in this country. Well, it might be between what you call voluntary co-operation and collectivism with an element of compulsion, but the weaker sections of the industry in this country have got to be organized. I am not quarrelling with the nomenclatures of particular types of co-operation or collectivism that might obtain in the country in the future but there is no denying that we do look to co-operative societies and co-operative organizations. Whatever might be the nature of control, that control is not exercised by the members of the industry themselves but by Government and the ultimate benefit goes to the members of the industry, and that, I think, Sir, must be the test whether any particular scheme is co-operative or not. So what we do propose initially is to confine our attention to those weavers who come within a co-operative society and our intention is to suggest to the State Governments that they should rigidly follow this system and encourage only those weavers who come to a co-operative society and then provide them facilities for the purpose as I said of marketing their products of yarn, and also in the matter of advising them in regard to dyeing, sizing, calendering and so on and also regarding designs and also improved

technique in the matter of using the modern type of handloom. But all this has to be done to a very large extent by the State Government. We have established an All India Handloom Board. To start with, that Board will be the agency which the Central Government will use to get into contact with the State Governments and review the work done under the State Governments. There is no intention really except in the matter of export, to centralize the activities in the hands of the All India Handloom Board. I propose suggesting to the State Governments that they should have parallel bodies in the States. I think they do exist in many States—in Madras, Bombay and perhaps in other States as well. But there may be variations in the manner in which each State will operate. We must leave it to them, in so far as they are agreeable to follow the scheme of persuasion to develop and organize the Handloom Industry on the basis of Co-operative Societies. It might be asked whether this money is enough to provide funds for these Co-operative Societies to act. I would at once say, it would not be enough. The money is there to provide funds only for the expenditure for offsetting losses and subsidies. The ways and means aspect must be covered by other means. It is not very difficult—if a Co-operative Society is properly organized—for them to obtain finance for the ways and means purposes, from a Co-operative Bank and I do propose to request the Governor of the Reserve Bank to encourage the lending by Cooperative Banks to these Societies dealing with handloom weavers by redis-counting the bills that may be drawn on them by the Reserve Bank. I therefore feel that the ultimate financial needs of these Societies do not present an insuperable problem so far as Government is concerned. That is broadly the manner in which the Fund is proposed to be used.

I would like to add before I resume my seat, one word in regard to parliamentary control. As I said, we have an All India Handloom Board and we shall ask the States to create parallel

bodies in the States. Primarily, the money will be given to the States. We shall not directly distribute! money except in regard perhaps to exports and probably to the Experimental Station which the Handloom Board might set up. In regard to the Khadi Board we have obtained the co-operation of very tried workers in this field—workers who are not in a sense, politicians— and very many of them who have very kindly consented to serve as Members of the All India Khadi and Village Industries Board are very frank critics of our Government. We have been very lucky in being able to persuade a person of the eminence of Shri V. L. Mehta to be the Chairman. He is a former Finance Minister of a State Government. In fact his agreement to be Chairman is itself a sort of guarantee that the money would be spent in the proper way and he will understand the inhibitions under which a Government working under a Parliamentary system, operates. I mention all this just to lead up to say that Parliamentary control over the allotment of funds would be complete. I strongly stress that the money will come into the Consolidated Fund and it will be spent by appropriations. In this year's budget we have allotted one crore for Khadi and one crore for Handloom. But it is more or less in the nature of token rather than that it would cover entirely our needs for the current year. But the needs will have to be assessed by budget probably made by the States in the case of Handloom Industry and by the All India Khadi and Village Industries Board in the case of Khadi. this budget being scrutinised by Government and the estimated money will be paid subject to Parliamentary sanction. There is no question of anything being done without Parliamentary sanction in this matter. Parliamentary control will be complete. That is all I have to say at the moment. Sir, I move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of an additional duty of excise on cloth for raising funds for the purpose of developing khadi and other handloom industries—

tries and for promoting the sale of khadi and other handloom cloth, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): Mr. Chairman, Sir, hand-spinning was of course, less than two centuries ago, the universal Cottage Industry of not only our country but of other countries as well. It was so before the machine age. Of course, now it has got its own value in our country though not on utilitarian basis, at least it is existing more on sentimental basis. Sir, I don't want to say anything about that. But of course I have got great regard for Khadi, simply because it is hand-spun. Sir, Mahatma Gandhi has said that without Cottage Industry the Indian peasant is doomed. He cannot maintain himself from the products of the land. He needs supplementary industry and it is with this object that that Great Soul had hit upon the idea of handspinning so that it may be a sort of supplementary or subsidiary income to the rural people who are unemployed for a major part in the year.

Sir, hand-spinning, in my opinion, should be completely set apart from handloom. Handloom is an industry which is occupied as a whole-time profession by those who are engaged in that industry but Khadi is used only as a sort of subsidiary income during the leisure hours of the rural masses.

I am not here to invite a controversy as to how far Khadi has really contributed to the rural economy of our country. It may be that one section of the House may say 'yes' and the other may say 'no'. But whatever it is I don't want to invite any controversy about that. But this much should be admitted that the Handloom Industry has of late suffered a great setback in our country. In my opinion our own Government is partly responsible for it. Take for instance the fact that in October 1949 the Government of India had announced their intention to purchase one-third of their requirements of cloth in the shape of hand-loom. Sir, very little had been done in that direction. One of the main

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu.] difficulties expressed by the Government of India was that as per the specification required by the consuming Departments of the Government of India, it is not possible for that particular variety of specification being extensively produced by the Handlooms in our country. The Madras Government recently requested the Government of India to see that the specification of their cloth requirements are so suitably modified as can be conveniently produced by handlooms. But what is the reply of the Government of India? The reply is that it will take considerable time—at least 2 years—to adopt themselves to the requirements suggested by the Madras Government. If that is the attitude of the Central Government, how is the Central Government to justify the bringing forward of this measure and to say that the mill made cloth will be taxed by way of an excise duty of 3 pies per yard. So I would suggest that it is the Central Government that should first come forward and say that the entire requirements of the consuming Departments of the Government of India should be met by handlooms.

Sir, I have to say a few words with regard to the marketing and export of handloom fabrics. With regard to export, I feel that much has not been done in this respect by our Government. There is great demand for Indian-made handlooms in foreign countries, like Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, Bangkok, Mombasa and to a certain extent New York and Paris also. I learn there is practically complete cessation of exports to Pakistan and the exports to Ceylon are diminishing gradually and recently I read in a paper that so far as export to Ceylon is concerned, Japan has been very keenly competing with the dumping of rayon silk there as a result of which Indian made handlooms are not able to compete with the cheap Japanese-made rayon silk. With all that, the very same newspaper adds, not much is being done by our Government there in Ceylon by making proper advertisements of Indian-made handloom

cloth in Ceylon. Of course, here also, they are opening exhibitions in foreign countries. Our embassies, I learn, do open show-rooms here and there. But with all that, in my opinion, that will not be sufficient. We want a persistent and virulent propaganda made in foreign countries, especially in the far-eastern countries where there is such a great demand for Indian-made handloom products.

Here, I would like to quote one instance to show how the Government of India have thoroughly failed in their duty to come forward and help a particular institution that wanted to open a depot in West Africa. I refer to the Madras Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society which I learn is one of the biggest co-operatives in the matter of production and distribution of handloom fabrics. When this Society endeavoured to open depots in foreign countries, especially in West Africa, the State Government suggested that the Society should first contact the shippers or their agents here and arrange for the export through them, and if they failed in their attempt then they could come forward to their help or rescue. At the same time, the Madras Government also moved the Central Government to sponsor a delegation of handloom industrialists in Indonesia and other far-eastern countries and explore the markets for hand-loom cloth. We do not know at what stage the matter is now. But, I would earnestly suggest that this sort of delegations to foreign countries, especially countries like Indonesia and others which greatly use Indian-made hand-looms, should be encouraged and bigger market explored for our hand-loom industries' products. Sir, I would also like to thank the Government for the recent imposition of the ban on the mills from producing particular varieties of *dhotis* and *sarees* and reserving particular varieties to the hand-looms. This has certainly benefited the masses, particularly those who are engaged in the handloom industry. At the same time I have got an idea. When there are so many textile mills

in the country producing so much of yarn, why is it that there is scarcity for yarn for the handlooms? The answer could only be this—that the yarn produced by these mills go only to serve the needs of those mills or other spinning mills. So while it may be appreciated that licences for more spindles should be given for the purpose of spinning, I would suggest that there should be no encouragement given for the opening of more weaving mills in our country and unless we do that and make yarn available to the handlooms, the handloom industry will certainly suffer. Sir, our Minister for Commerce and Industry seems to have become a great supporter of distribution through co-operatives. I find today he has a very changed mind, because on several occasions on the floor of the House he had been stating that co-operatives did not really do any good. I am glad that he has accepted that co-operatives had done a lot in the matter of the distribution of the yarn to the handloom weavers through co-operative societies. Sir, - though I have nothing to do with the Madras Handloom Co-operative Society, I think I know a little about it. This society is one of the biggest in South India and nearly 1,80,000 looms are being catered by it. It does a business of about Rs. 60 lakhs annually in the purchase and sale of the finished goods of the handloom weavers. In 1952 alone, I know, this society purchased and distributed 50,000 bales of yarn and the society had to its credit the sponsoring of a textile mill of its own at Guntakal although it has only about 11,000 spindles. Only a weavers' society could become member and no individual could become a member of that particular co-operative textile mill. The yarn produced by the mill is distributed only to weavers' societies. The share capital has been completely contributed by the weavers' co-operative societies. The share capital is about Rs. 22 lakhs so far and the mill produces only low count yarns that are required by hand-loom weavers of that particular area, and it has also to see that only medium

and coarse cloth are produced by the yarn from this mill. I am glad the Central Government has contributed about Rs. 1 lakhs from the Handloom Development Fund. But for a mill costing about Rs. 30 lakhs, a contribution of only Rs. 1 lakh may not be sufficient and I would earnestly request the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry to see that this aid is increased to about Rs. 2 lakhs if not to Rs. 5 lakhs

Sir, there is one serious draw-back so far as the Handloom Weavers' Cooperative Society in Madras is concerned and that draw-back is the want of capital. The co-operative structure is primarily meant for the benefit of the agriculturists and any amount, any credit that is being accommodated by any co-operative society to any producer or consumer's society, that is only its secondary duty. So every co-operative society not only in Madras but in every other State in India primarily concentrates on giving credit to the agriculturists. If any money is left with them, then they think of financing consumer societies and also producers' societies, such as the hand-loom weavers' society. So this is a very great handicap so far as the handloom industry is concerned—want of credit.

I would earnestly suggest, Sir, that the Commerce & Industry Minister should see that more adequate finance is made available to the handlooms in the whole of India and co-operative handlooms in our country.

Then, Sir, the hon. Minister has been suggesting that calendering and other kinds of plants would be installed very soon. The Madras Handloom Weavers' Society had recently set up a calendering plant somewhere in Salem District, probably in Erode or so which cost nearly Rs. 51 lakhs of rupees and I am glad to say that the Central Government has contributed Rs. 2,15,700 from the Handloom Development Fund for that purpose.

[Shri Rajagopal Naidu.] Of course, this calendering plant is good because it gives finish to the hand-looms that are exported to the foreign countries and, it is only those goods that are calendered and properly bleached that find great sale in foreign countries. So, there should be more number of calendering and bleaching plants put up in our country so that the cloth produced will have fine polish and may find ready market.

Then, Sir, I would like to say a few words about research and scholarship. Sir, to improve the handloom industry, to improve the technique of production and to grant scholarship the Madras Handloom Weavers' Society had set apart about Rs. 1.38 lakhs. Sir, when a single Society can set apart Rs. 1.38 lakhs for the purpose of research and scholarship, the Government of India should come forward and set apart a very large amount for this purpose so that the young people who are engaged in this industry may get well trained up to see that this industry comes up and a great start is made in this direction.

Sir, I would like to criticise about *one* action that the Madras Government has taken, namely, the levy of supervision fees on all the co-operative weavers' societies. Sir, the Madras Government, instead of coming forward to the rescue and help of these societies with money, what they are doing is that they are levying a supervision fee of 2 per cent, on the net profits of the society upto a certain maximum and I find that several thousands, if not lakhs, of rupees had been realised by the Madras Government in the matter of the supervision fees. Sir, absolutely no extra establishment has been appointed by the Madras Government to supervise the handloom weavers' societies but, with ail that, the Madras Government want to make a profit out of it by collecting 2 per cent, of the net profits. Sir, in my opinion, it is most inhuman to ask the weavers' societies to pay 2 per cent, of the net profits for pur-

poses of supervision especially as no extra establishment has been appointed by the Madras Government to supervise these societies. Sir, the hon.. Minister has been saying that it is not the intention to give any doles to the weavers. I am not asking him to give any doles but I only ask him to see, Sir, that certain relief schemes are given and some provision for long term cheap credit is made available to the co-operative societies. Sir, I would suggest that the State should, grant interest free loans to societies. The relief schemes which were working usefully in Madras State till the end of last year had been wound up this year: I do not know the reason and I would suggest that these schemes should be revived. The Madras State is providing interest free loans for the weavers outside the co-operative movement at the rate of Rs. 25-per individual in order to enable them to become Members of the co-operative societies so that there would be a continuous supply of yarn to these weavers. It is a very good move, Sir, and I would suggest that the Central Government also moves in this direction and sees that some amount is given to the handloom weavers who are outside the co-operative movement so that they may utilise the amount for the purpose of becoming Members of co-operative societies so that they will be getting a continuous supply of yarn.

Then, Sir, I would suggest that there should be a sort of discrimination in the matter of levy of Excise Duties. I would suggest that Excise Duties should be levied on superfine and fine varieties of mill made cloth but not on the coarse and medium varieties for this reason. Sir, that if Excise Duties are levied on coarse and medium varieties, it would certainly affect the poor men because it is only the poor men who use these varieties. Sir, I may even go to the extent, of suggesting that the Excise Duty should be increased from a quarter of an anna to half an anna on the superfine

and fine varieties and that no Excise Duty should be levied on the medium and coarse varieties.

Then, Sir, coming to the Bill itself. I have tabled two amendments- One is to alter the word "may" into "shall". In clause (4)—application of the proceeds—"the Central Government may utilise". Sir, I have got my own apprehension because in an analogous case, especially the Excise Duty that has been levied on oil seeds, the object was the development of the oil seeds; but, I do not find. Sir.—I am a grower myself—any benefit out of it; no effect had reached the agriculturist masses and I do not know, Sir, how that money is being utilised. So much so, there is a sort of fear amongst the people that if any Excise Duty is levied for purposes of promoting any trade or industry or any agriculture that money is not being used only for that purpose and it goes on getting accumulated or it gets diverted in some other way. So, Sir, the word "may", I would suggest, should be altered and the word "shall" be used so that the "Rs. 5 crores that is going to be collected should be compulsorily spent only for the purpose of development of khadi and the other handloom industries. It is only with that object, Sir, that I had suggested this amendment.

I would also suggest that it should be mentioned now, on the floor of the House itself as to what is the amount that is going to be spent on the handloom industry for development of the handloom industry and what is the amount that is going to be spent for the purpose of the khadi industry. It is better, Sir, that the percentage of the amount that is going to be spent on these two industries is mentioned on the floor of the House so that let it not be said, Sir, that out of Rs. 5 crores, four crores of rupees should be utilised for purposes of development of khadi and only one crore for the development of handloom. Hand-looms must be given the most important position in the matter of the development in this country. It may be, Sir, that for various reasons the Cen-

tral Government may think that more money should be spent on khadi but, I would suggest that it is only the handlooms that should be given preference in the matter of development and in the matter of the money

श्री डी० नारायण (बम्बई) : अध्यक्ष

महोदय, हमारे माननीय कामर्स मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो यह खादी बिल इतने दिनों के बाद हमारे सामने रखा है, उसके लिए मैं उनको बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। मैं नहीं समझ सका कि हमारे कामर्स मेम्बर जी ने अपने भाषण में इतना apologetic tone का उपयोग क्यों किया। कोई आवश्यकता इस बात की नहीं थी, परन्तु शक होता है कि जितना महत्वपूर्ण इस बिल को हम समझते हैं उतना शायद हमारे माननीय मन्त्री इसे नहीं समझते हैं। हमारा यह वह उद्योग है जिस उद्योग से इस देश के करोड़ों आदमी अपना उद्योग करते थे, रोजगार करते थे और सारी दुनिया से व्यापार करते थे। एक जमाना आया जबकि जबरन हमारा यह उद्योग मारा गया और इसके लिए वह तरीके सोचे गये जिनको देखने से आप लोगों को पता चलेगा कि इतना निन्दनीय कार्य हिन्दुस्तान की किसी भी सरकार ने नहीं किया जितना कि इस उद्योग को मारने के लिए ब्रिटिश सल्तनत ने किया था। ब्रिटिश सल्तनत के साथ हमने भी इस काम में

[Shri D. Narayan.]

सहयोग दिया जिसका यह नतीजा हुआ कि आज यह उद्योग खतम सा हो गया है। मैं तो यह चाहता था कि यह बिल स्वराज्य मिलते ही लाया जाना चाहिए था परन्तु एक कहावत है कि "better late than never"; आज हम एक ऐसा कदम आगे बढ़ा रहे हैं जिससे इस देश की निश्चित तरक्की हो सकती है।

आप जानते हैं कि भारतवर्ष एक कृषि प्रधान देश है। यहां की २५ करोड़ जनता खेती पर निर्भर है और हमारी खेती एक ऐसी खेती है जो ज्यादा से ज्यादा ६ महीने से ज्यादा काम नहीं दे सकती है। खेती करने वाले ग्रामीण भाई और बहिनें साल में ६ महीने निरुद्योग रहते हैं। वह ऐसे निरुद्योग नहीं रहते कि साल में ६ महीने तक लगातार काम ही न हो बल्कि बीच बीच में निरुद्योगी रहते हैं। कभी साल में दो महीने काम होता है तो फिर एक महीने काम नहीं होता और कभी एक महीने काम होता है तो फिर १५ दिन निरुद्योग रहते हैं। इस तरह से करीब २५ करोड़ जनता ६ महीने तक निरुद्योग रहती है। मैं आपसे पूछता हूँ कि ऐसा कौन उद्योग हो सकता है जो हमारे इतने ग्रामीण भाई और बहिनों को उनके बेकार समय में उद्योग दे सकता है। राजा जी ने सन् १९२१ में कहा था कि Hand spinning is wealth turned out of waste क्योंकि यह एक ऐसी चीज है कि जो हर एक व्यक्ति के आलस्य के समय को काम में लगा देती है। हमारे पूज्य महात्मा गांधी जी ने जो चर्खों का मुझाव दिया था वह एक ऐसी चीज है जिससे हम उन तमाम ग्रामीण भाई और बहिनों को घर बैठे एक उद्योग दे सकते हैं। आप स्वयं ही सोचें कि २५ करोड़ जनता साल में ६ महीने बेरोजगार रहती है और

इसका फल यह हो जाता है कि करीब १२॥ करोड़ जनता वर्ष भर बेकाम रहती है। प्लानिंग कमीशन ने इस बेकारी को हटाने की बहुत सी तजवीजें बतलाई हैं, बहुत से उद्योग बतलाये हैं और साथ ही साथ खेती की तरक्की के बारे में भी सुझाव दिये हैं। परन्तु सारे उद्योगों से आखिरकार कितनों को उद्योग मिल सकेगा, इसका भी तसफिया उसमें दिया हुआ है। अगर प्लानिंग कमीशन के बताये हुए उद्योग सब शुरू हो जायें तो उनके हिसाब से ज्यादा से ज्यादा ५५॥ लाख आदमियों को काम मिल सकेगा जबकि हमें इस देश में करोड़ों आदमियों को काम देना है। इस तरह से डर मालूम होता है कि ५५॥ लाख आदमियों को भी उद्योग मिल सकेगा या नहीं। हमारी सरकार पंचवर्षीय योजना में २,०७९ करोड़ रुपया खर्च करने जा रही है जिससे कि ५५॥ लाख आदमियों को उद्योगों में लगाया जा सकेगा। तो आप स्वयं सोच सकते हैं कि इस तरह से यह काम कैसे हो सकता है जबकि हमें देश के कई करोड़ों को उद्योग देना है। जिस चाल और जिस गति से हम जाना चाहते हैं उस गति से हम कितने वर्षों में १२ करोड़ तक पहुँच सकेंगे। इसके बाद मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि १२ करोड़ आदमियों को कौन सा उद्योग दिया जा सकता है। क्या यह काम कारखाने खोल कर हो सकता है? मैं राष्ट्रपिता महात्मा गांधी जी के कुछ शब्द आपको पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ जिसमें उन्होंने साफ तौर से यह विचार प्रकट किया है:

Mechanization is good when the hands are too few for the work intended to be accomplished. It is art evil when there are mere hands that are required for the work, as is the case in India. I may not use a plough for digging a few square yards of a plot of land. The problem with us is not how to find leisure for the teeming;

millions inhabiting our villages. The problem is how to utilize their idle hours, which are equal to the working days of six months in the year. Strange as it may appear, every mill generally is a menace to the villagers. I have not worked out the figures, but I am quite safe in saying that every mill-hand does the work of at least ten labourers doing the same work in their villages. In other words, he earns more than he did in his village at the expense of ten fellow-villagers. Thus spinning and weaving mills have deprived the villagers of a substantial means of livelihood.

तो आपको पता चलेगा कि १२ करोड़ देहातियों को हम सिवाय चर्खों के और कोई उद्योग नहीं दे सकते। चर्खा ही ऐसा उद्योग है जिसमें बहुत कम पूंजी की जरूरत पड़ती है, जिसमें विशेष वृद्धि की भी आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ती। चर्खा ही एक ऐसा उद्योग है जिसको जब चाहो अलग कर सकते हो और जिधर चाहो उठा सकते हो। चर्खा वह उद्योग है जिससे तैयार होने वाले मून से हमारी खुद की कपड़े की आवश्यकता पूरी हो सकती है और जिसके लिए दुनिया के बाजारों का आश्रय नहीं लेना पड़ेगा।

हमारे देश में सन् १९५१ तक, १०३ स्पिनिंग मिलें और २७५ कम्पोजिट मिलें थीं और अप्रैल १९५१ से १९५२ के मार्च तक १६ नई मिलें और खुलीं और १३ बंद रही हैं। मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता है कि मिलों की बढ़ोतरी क्यों की जा रही है। जब आप देश के लिए खादी को आवश्यक समझते हैं और हैंडलूम को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं और वे बढ़ सकते हैं तो फिर यह समझ में नहीं आता है कि मिलों को क्यों इस देश में बढ़ावा दिया जा रहा है। इन मिलों के बढ़ने से तो खादी और हैंडलूम पर बहुत बुरा असर पड़ेगा। वे चल नहीं सकेंगी। आप जानते हैं कि एक

तरफ तो आप हैंडलूम और खादी को बढ़ावा देना चाहते हैं और दूसरी तरफ आप मिलों को बढ़ा रहे हैं बला यह कैसे हो सकता है? इससे आपको तो मिलों के ऊपर बन्धन और कंट्रोल लगाने होंगे, जिससे कि आप इन उद्योगों को बढ़ा सकें। एक ओर मिलें बढ़ाई जा रही हैं और दूसरी ओर खादी को उत्तेजना दी जा रही है, यह बात विचित्र सी मालूम होती है। यदि खादी बढ़ती है तो मिलें घटनी ही चाहियें और मिलें बढ़ती ही रहेंगी तो खादी और हैंडलूम जीवित नहीं रह सकते हैं। एक की प्रगति में दूसरी की मृत्यु है, यह बात हमको अच्छी तरह से समझ लेनी चाहिए। यदि खादी को गांव गांव तक पहुंचाना है तो मिलों को धीरे धीरे बन्द करना ही होगा। इसलिए मुझे आप से कहना है कि आप यह दोनों बातें साथ-साथ नहीं चला सकते हैं। यह दो तलवारें एक मियान में कभी भी नहीं रखी जा सकती हैं।

आज हमारे देश में जो पौने चार सौ मिलें हैं उनमें कितने आदमी काम करते हैं? मुश्किल से करीब ८ लाख मजदूर इन मिलों में काम करते हैं। हमारे गवर्नमेंट के पास तो कोई हिसाब नहीं है मगर मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि ८ लाख आदमी तो आज भी खादी उद्योग से अपना पेट भर रहे हैं। हमारे देश में २८,५१,६८५ हैंडलूम हैं और उनमें करीब १ करोड़ से ज्यादा जनता काम में लगी हुई है और अपना पेट भर रही है। हमारी मिलों में १०० करोड़ रुपया लगा हुआ है और उससे ८ लाख जनता को रोजगार मिल रहा है। अगर आप इस देश में और भी मिलें बढ़ायेंगे तो आप स्वयं सोच सकते हैं कि कितने व्यक्तियों को वह रोजगार दिला सकती हैं। इसके विपरीत आपने देखा होगा कि हैंडलूम से कितने लोगों को रोजगार मिल सकता है। अगर हमारी सरकार इस ओर विशेष ध्यान दे तो इस समय देश में

[Shri D. Narayan.]

ओ बेकार लोग हैं उनमें से बहुतों को इस उद्योग में आसानी के साथ लगाया जा सकता है। मगर इस समय तो हैंडलूम की हालत बहुत ही दयनीय है। मद्रास शहर में हैंडलूम वाले भीख मांग रहे हैं। बम्बई स्टेट में भी निरुद्योग दिनों दिन बढ़ता ही चला जा रहा है। और वहां पर भी हैंडलूम की हालत निराशाजनक है ४० और ६० इस तरह मिल और हैंडलूम के बीच धोतियों का बंटवार करके। यह एक निराशाजनक बात है और सरकार इस उद्योग के साथ अन्याय कर रही है हैंडलूम के लिए पूरी धोतियां छोड़ देनी चाहियें। अगर आप हैंडलूम को बचाना चाहते हैं तो सरकार को हर तरह से उसकी मदद करनी चाहिए जिससे कि वह अच्छी तरह से इस देश में पनप सकें। अभी आज के ही अखबारों में आपने पढ़ा होगा कि बम्बई प्रान्त के हैंडलूम बोर्ड की सभा हुई और उसने यह सिफारिश की है कि सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट को मिलों को यह आदेश दे देना चाहिए कि मिलों में किसी प्रकार की धोतियां न बनने पायें जिससे कि सम्पूर्ण धोती हैंडलूम द्वारा ही तैयार की जा सकें। मैं आश करता हूं कि हैंडलूम की सिफारिशों को सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट अवश्य ध्यान में रखेगी।

कहा जाता है कि मिल का कपड़ा सस्ता है और खादी महंगी है, हैंडलूम का कपड़ा महंगा है।

[Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

खादी महंगी है और मिल का कपड़ा सस्ता है परन्तु मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या इंसान सस्ता है? आज दुनिया में इंसान को हमने इतना सस्ता बना दिया है कि उसकी कोई परवाह नहीं की जाती। वह भूखा है, नंगा है, बीमार है, मर रहा है लेकिन उसकी कोई परवाह नहीं है। यदि हमारे अर्थ शास्त्र और हमारी सामाजिक

व्यवस्था का आधार इंसान है तो हमें देखना चाहिए कि उसे स्वाभिमानपूर्वक पेट भर खाना मिलता है और पेट भरने के लिए उद्योग मिलता है यह नहीं। एक को उद्योग करके हजारों मिल जाये और दूसरे को मुश्किल से चार आना भी न मिले। यह अर्थशास्त्र मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। अर्थशास्त्र तो वही है जो इंसान को इंसान बनने में मदद करे, उसके प्रतिष्ठा के साथ जिन्दा रहने में मदद करे और सामाजिक व्यवस्था ऐसी हो जोकि न्यायपूर्ण हो और जो समता की ओर ले जाने वाली हो।

आप यदि गत १०० वर्ष के इतिहास को देखेंगे तो मालूम होगा कि किस तरह से मिल के उद्योग को हमने बढ़ाया, किस तरह से पैसे से मदद की, ड्यूटी से की, एक्साइज से मदद की। किस बात की हमने मदद नहीं दी? आज भी हम देखते हैं कि बहुत से छोटे मोटे उद्योग हैं जिनमें बहुत थोड़े लोग काम कर रहे हैं और उनको हम प्रोटेक्शन दे रहे हैं परन्तु जो लाखों और करोड़ों को उद्योग देने वाली खादी है और हैंडलूम है उसको प्रोटेक्शन देते वक्त, उसको सहारा देते वक्त, हमारे सामने महंगाई और सस्ताई का सवाल पैदा होता है। हमने यह कभी नहीं सोचा कि हम कहां बैठे हुए हैं। यदि हम करोड़ों बेकारों की परवाह नहीं करेंगे तो ये करोड़ों बेकार हमारे साथ किस तरह से पेश आयेंगे इसको भी हमें सोचना चाहिए।

मैं आपसे बड़े अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे खादी का अर्थशास्त्र एक अपना अर्थशास्त्र है। हमारा ग्रामीण अर्थशास्त्र है और हमारा अर्थशास्त्र एक सनातन पुरातन-अर्थशास्त्र है। उसका आधार मानवता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि खादी का अर्थशास्त्र अत्यन्त प्रगतिशील है, क्रांतिकारी है और भविष्य को निगाह में रखने

वाला है और भविष्य को निगाह में रखकर ही महात्मा गांधी ने इस खादी के अर्थशास्त्र को दुनिया के सामने रखा। यदि आप दूर की सोचेंगे तो आपकी निगाह में आयेगा कि यही एक अर्थशास्त्र है जो दुनिया को बचाने वाला है। खादी का अर्थशास्त्र त्रेतायुगीन नहीं है, प्रतिगामी नहीं है। अभी कुछ दिन हुए डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद ने एक सन्देश भेजते हुए कहा था “खादी भारत में एक दैवी समाज की स्थापना का मुख्य साधन है। राष्ट्रपिता खादी को केवल स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति का साधन ही नहीं मानते थे बल्कि वे उसे व्यक्ति की सच्ची आंतरिक भावना को जगाने वाली और विकसित करने वाली समझते थे।”

अतः यदि हमें एक नये समाज का निर्माण करना है जो कि न्याय और समता पर आधारित हो तो हमें उस संघर्ष को जो पैसे की वजह से और स्वार्थ की वजह से पैदा होता है उसको कम करना होगा। यदि आप दुनिया से लड़ाइयों को और युद्धों को मिटाना चाहते हैं तो आपकी अर्थ व्यवस्था और समाज व्यवस्था ऐसी होनी चाहिए कि जिसमें कोई निरुद्योगी न हो और सबमें आपस में समता हो, परस्पर प्रेम हो और सहकार्य हो। पड़ोसी धर्म तो हम भूल गये। आप जिसको चाहते हैं उसको स्वदेशी कह देते हैं। मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि स्वदेशी वह है जोकि पड़ोसी को उद्योग देती हो। जो पड़ोसी को निरुद्योगी करे वह स्वदेशी नहीं हो सकता। स्वदेशी के माने हैं पड़ोसी धर्म। पड़ोसी तो भूखा मरे और दूर के को उद्योग मिले यह स्वदेशी कैसी। जब हम अपने पड़ोसी की फिक्र करेंगे तभी अपने देश और समाज की फिक्र कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि इस बिल को, इस खादी के प्रश्न को, इस निगाह से देखें कि इसमें भविष्य के लिए सारी क्रान्ति भरी हुई है और हम एक ऐसा

कदम उठा रहे हैं जो क्रान्तिकारी सिद्ध होने वाला है, यदि हम प्रमाणिक हैं। यदि आज का समय टालने के लिए यह काम हो तब तो कुछ होने वाला नहीं है परन्तु मैं नहीं मानता कि यह काम आज का समय टालने के लिए है। मैं तो मानता हूँ कि यह दूर के लिए सोच कर एक कदम उठाया गया है।

आखिरी एक ही बात और कहनी है और वह यह है कि सिर्फ इस बिल के पास करने के या चार पांच करोड़ रुपये खर्च करने से खादी चलने वाली नहीं है, ग्रामोद्योग चलने वाले नहीं हैं, हैंडलूम चलने वाला नहीं है। हमें तो अपनी आदतों को बदलना होगा। हमारी आदत बिगाड़ गई है। हमारी आदतें शहरी बन गई हैं। हमारी आदतें ऐसी बन गई हैं कि जो हमारे काबू से बाहर हो गई हैं। आप यह सोचिये कि हिन्दुस्तान एक ऐसा देश है जहाँ की जनता अनुकरणप्रिय है, आप लोगों का अनुकरण बाहर वाले करते हैं। यदि आप चाहते हैं कि खादी का प्रचार हो, खादी बने, हैंडलूम के कपड़े का व्यवहार हो तो आप उन्हें अपनाइये। यदि आप अगुआ बनना चाहते हैं, यदि इस देश के प्रतिनिधि बनना चाहते हैं और इस देश को आगे ले जाना चाहते हैं तो आप जनता की ओर देखिए न कि यह कि आप जनता को अपनी ओर देखने में लगावें। आप जनता को देखेंगे तो वह आपका अच्छा अनुकरण करेगी। इसलिए मैं खास तौर से प्रार्थना करूँगा कि यदि सरकार इस बिल को पास करती है और मानती है तो सरकार का यह फर्ज हो जाता है और सरकार के चलाने वाले, सरकार को मानने वाले, कांग्रेस वाले और विन-कांग्रेस वाले, सबका यह धर्म हो जाता है कि वह खादी को अपनावें ताकि ग्रामीण लोग जो आपके पीछे चलने वाले बन गये हैं वह उसे अपनाने लगें। जब तक हम खादी को नहीं अपनायेंगे, ग्रामीण उद्योगों को

[Shri D. Narayan.]

स्वीकार नहीं करेंगे, जब तक हैंडलूम को उत्तेजन नहीं देंगे तब तक ग्राम वाले कुछ नहीं कर सकेंगे।

आज हम यह सोचते हैं कि यह तो गावों के लिए है, यह तो देहातों के लिए है और हम उस दुनिया से दूर हैं। यदि हम ग्रामीण भाइयों से जुदा रहना चाहेंगे तो याद रखिए कि ऐसा बिल और ऐसी बातें यशस्वी होने वाली नहीं हैं। मैंने अभी सुना था कि हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर कुछ दिन हुए पूज्य विनोबा जी से मिलने गये थे और पूज्य विनोबा जी ने उनसे कहा था कि यदि आप इस देश का भला चाहते हैं और अपनी सारी योजनाओं को यशस्वी करना चाहते हैं तो आप एक ही काम करें कि हिन्दुस्तान के बच्चे बच्चे को, छोटे बड़े को, स्त्रियों को, बड़े बूढ़ों को, सबको सूत कातना सिखला दीजिये और मेरा विश्वास है कि इस देश का इसमें ही भला है और यह देश तभी महात्मा गांधी के उस आदर्श की ओर चलने में पूर्ण रूप से समर्थ होगा जहां महात्मा गांधी इस देश को चंचल बना चाहते थे ?

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 101.]

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in his opening speech my hon. friend the Minister for Commerce and Industry said he would anticipate criticisms, but I find he has not anticipated most of my criticisms. I am not going into the economic controversy about the place of khadi and handloom in our country today. I shall look at the Bill from the point of view of the situation as it prevails, and particularly from the standpoint of the nearly 1½ crores of handloom weavers who are dependent on the handloom industry. If we look at the Bill from that point of view, we find that it is a belated and half-hearted attempt to provide some relief to the handloom workers, and, therefore, I also offer my

etc. Bill, 1953

limited support to this Bill. But I shall be failing in my duty if I do not explain why this Bill is belated as well as half-hearted. I have to make some more points also. It is belated because, Sir, while I was digging up the old files and newspapers, I found that the handloom industry was suffering from a crisis from 1951. In February 1952 nearly 90 per cent, of the looms were idle and the handloom weavers in this country were thrown out of job and they were faced with a serious crisis. There were conferences of unemployed people. In May 1952 there was a conference of unemployed people in Malabar and they pointed out at that time that in Malabar about 20,000 people were thrown out of job. Not only those people who were dependent on the handloom industry, but also small tradesmen and middle-class people were passing through a very critical situation. That conference also made concrete suggestions to the Government for the relief of that crisis in the handloom industry. Then again I find that in the last part of July there was a mass meeting in Tandah, in Fyzabad, in Uttar Pradesh, where the handloom and calico printing industry were also facing a very critical situation. 7,000 out of 9,000 looms were dead and the workers were practically starving. Though, Sir, handlooms are concentrated in the South, still there are handlooms in other provinces. I have quoted the example of Uttar Pradesh. There are handlooms in Bengal also. There also there was this cry of distress. Still the Government did not wake up from its slumber in time as is the practice of the Government. Then it was towards the end of 1952 when the Government woke up towards this matter. Why? There are reasons to suspect that the Government did wake up to this matter because at the end of 1952, the textile magnates were faced with a difficult position. There were accumulated stocks in the hands of the textile magnates. So the Government, in the interest of the textile magnates, came out and posed itself as the friend of handloom weavers.

The order of the Government restricting the production of 60 per cent, of *dhotis* and *sarees* helps the textile magnates and none else. It does not help even the smaller millowners. I shall quote the example of West Bengal. There 90 per cent, of their production consists of *dhotis* and sarees. So what was the result of this order? The mill owners were faced with a difficult situation and as is the practice, they passed on the burden to the labourers. This order practically gave the green signal to the magnates to go on with the policy of retrenchment and of fleecing the consumers. In Bengal, so far as my information goes, the major part of the production 'If only the Keshoram Cotton Mills consists of shirtings etc. It is dependent mainly on exports. But the situation regarding other mills is quite different. We find that today people are practically half-naked and ill clad. It cannot be said that because there is so much excess of cloth that people cannot use it, therefore the production should be curtailed. The outlook of the Government is not only antiquated but also reactionary.

Sir, I found in the Report of the Commerce and Industry Ministry—a remark—that due to consumer's resistance stocks of cloth accumulated. Sir, this is a term which was coined by the reactionary capitalist economists in order to put the burden on the shoulders of the consumers and workers and to hide the real issue. Where does the consumer's resistance really come from? It comes from the lack of purchasing power of the people. Their purchasing power is at the lowest ebb. So the real attempt should be made to raise their purchasing power. Maybe, that is not the concern of only the Commerce and Industry Ministry. But here I am criticising the policy of the entire Government.

Then, Sir, I said that this measure is half-hearted. Why? Because the real problem facing the handloom industry today is the problem of accumulated stocks. Unless an attempt

is made to clear the accumulated stocks, real help cannot be given to them. So the Government should come with a proposal to clear the accumulated stocks. Government can make a bulk purchase of the accumulated stock of the handloom cloth. Government spends a huge amount for textile purchases every year—perhaps to the tune of Rs. 9 crores. Either all or most of the amount can go towards the purchase of handloom cloth. In that way they can help the handloom weavers. Then there is a large number of unemployed handloom weavers. They require immediate relief, unemployment doles and supply of rations. Without doing this what can be done to help the handloom weavers. I do not understand. The supply of cheap credit to the handloom weavers and owners may be provided so that they can run their factories. Then the supply of free yarn is also another question. I find that some free yarn is supplied to the handloom weavers, but that is very insufficient. So, Sir, attempts should be made either to reduce the cost of yarn or to supply cheap yarn to the handloom weavers.

As regards unemployment relief, one of my friends has given notice of certain amendments and I think he will deal with this aspect of the matter.

Then as regards the utilisation of this fund, I have also some apprehensions as my hon. friend Shri Raja-gopal Naidu had said that these funds I fear may be utilized to boost up *khadi* at the expense of the hand-loom industry. I am not a believer in the economics of khaddar but I have no quarrel with *khadi* because some people are depending on *khadi*. But the bulk of this fund should go towards the relief of handloom weavers.

Lastly, Sir, I want to make another point that it should be imposed on superfine cloth and not on coarse and medium cloth, because that is going to affect the poorer people and the poorer sections of the consumers. That is all, Sir.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman. I like to support the Bill which is moved by the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry. I first congratulate him on the way in which he has tackled the problem of textile industry and has relaxed many controls by which many men are in employment. I thank him for taking up this Bill in full vigour. The hand-loom industry cannot naturally survive with the competition of mill cloth owing to cost of production, which is very much higher.

Sir, there are many handicaps from which the handloom weaver is suffering. Amongst those handicaps the main ones are mentioned in clause i and the last two are most important "i.e. standardising of qualities and giving facilities for processing. Unless the cloth is processed, sufficient market for handloom cloth will not be available. And then the co-operative societies can also remove many of the handicaps which are at present suffered by the handloom weavers. Over and above this, there is the assurance that arrangements will be made with the Reserve Bank to make credit available to the handloom industry. I may tell this House here that it will require Rs. 25 crores to finance the handloom industry properly if it is to run on efficient and economic basis and if it is to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest and not to be exploited by middle men who are financing these people and taking most of their profits. These handicaps will naturally be removed by cooperative organisation and I think Rs. 1 crore will be sufficient.

The main handicap which is lying with the handloom industry is wages and I think. Sir, with regard to that it will be impossible for the handloom industry to compete in spite of the measures which are before us. I may tell you, Sir, that the handloom weaver is able to produce cloth to the extent of 8 to 10 yards while the mill weaver is producing cloth to the extent of 90 to 100 yards in a period of

8 hours. So the cost of production is ten times more in the case of hand-looms. Now, Sir, the mill-weaver is paid an average wage to the extent of Rs. 140 per month and I consider that the handloom weaver living in the rural area will be satisfied with much less, and taking the basis to be Rs. 45 or 1/3rd of the mill rate, I think that if he finds employment he will be very much satisfied. Even then, Sir, the cost of production will be three times as much in the matter of weaving charges if woven through the handloom weaver. Now, Sir, weaving charges in the matter of mill cloth amounts to 10 per cent, of the cost of production. Now when the handloom weaver has to bear three times as much charge, then the cost of production goes by 20 per cent, over the mill's cost price with 30 per cent, more of the wages. So the total cost will be 20 per cent, higher on an average. Now, Sir, the mill industry is trying to mechanise their industries and they will gradually be able to reduce their cost by elimination of weavers' charges. The machines that are now produced in various countries by researches by those countries who want to export their products are such that the strength of mill labour can be reduced to even one half. But the Hon. Minister is alive to the situation and he has put all restrictions on the importation of such machinery as will reduce labour to an undesirable degree. But owing to the 20 per cent, cost of wages which the handloom will not be able to bear in competition. I may say, Sir, that the handloom industry, because it is a specialised industry and special designs and special patterns are woven by the handloom weavers, will be able to stand competition with the mill industry to the extent of 100 to 200 million yards, the reason being that it will not be economic for the mill industry to have these special designs, the colour-matching, etc. on a large scale when the demand is only for a 100 to 200 million yards to meet which the hand-loom industry is well placed. I may here say, Sir, that the target of 'ne

handloom industry which the Planning Commission have set down are 1,700 million yards at the end of the five year period and 1,500 million yards will be therefore necessary on an average during the first five years. Therefore we have to see the production of 1,500 million yards by the handloom industry and if we want to do it, Sir, we have got to see how that can be done and how this disadvantage of 20 per cent, in the matter of wages can be wiped out. Demands are at present met, partly as they have been met in the past, owing some support to the handloom industry. But I say, Sir, that in many matters the help is not adequate. There is the excise duty on cloth. On coarse and medium it is 3 pies per yard; on fine it is 0/1/3 and on superfine 0/3/3. Over and above that the States are imposing sales tax both on coarse and medium cloth as well as on fine and superfine cloth. This *new* additional excise duty will also be levied at a uniform scale of three pies per yard. Sir, the protection that will be given with all these measures against the mill cloth to the handloom weaver will be 12½ per cent, in my opinion in the case of coarse and medium, 20 per cent, in the case of fine and 21 per cent, in the case of superfine. Therefore the advantages which the handloom weaver will get in the matter of competition with mill cloth will be sufficient in cases of production of fine and superfine cloth. But the total production required in the *country* of fine and superfine cloth is about 1,400 million yards and at present handloom is catering to the extent of 300 million yards. With the help that is sought to be given to the handloom industry under Clause 4 of the Bill I consider that about 50 per cent, of fine and superfine cloth produced by the handloom weaver will be able to stand the competition with mill cloth and I think, Sir, if proper steps are taken under clause 4 it is not impossible to achieve this end because if the handloom industry is able to cater to the needs of the consumer to the extent of 5 to 1 hundred mil-

lion yards then some of its problems will be solved. So the cause of hand-loom industry in case of coarse and fine and superfine does not suffer any great disadvantage. But the main disadvantage lies in that that at present the weavers are not used to the making of fine and superfine cloth, not that they cannot weave it but they have not been used to it because in the past yarn of that type was not adequately supplied to them because fine and superfine yarn were still used by the mills only and only when the process of diverting mill-made cloth begins, I mean, only when the process of reducing the mill-made cloth from fine and superfine to coarse and medium is begun, the handloom industry will be able to stand the competition from the mills. I think, Sir, with these advantages and with the help which is proposed to be given by clause 4 of this Bill the handloom industry will have a market and in regard to fine and superfine especially and when the processing plant which is most essential for dyeing, printing etc. is installed under the organisation of the co-operative society then, Sir, this handloom cloth will then be able to stand competition with the mill cloth. But that is not all. The main difficulty arises in the case of coarse and medium and the difficulty is much greater because the help that is sought to be given by these various measures and sales tax comes to the extent of 12½ per cent. only. Now 7½ per cent. is a handicap to the handloom weaver and this disadvantage should be removed. Then with regard to fine and superfine, arrangement also will have to be made with the mills by which the spinning mills should be asked gradually to revert to the spinning of fine, and superfine counts of yard by which the handloom weaver will be able to weave that cloth. He should be supplied adequately with fine and superfine yarn of right type, right quality, right count, right turns and right twist. This is the main thing because the present yarn supplied by the mills is not proper or adequate. Some of the mills have got their own

[Sfari C. P. Parikh.]

established markets for the supply of good standard quality yarn but in respect of some other mills which are weaving yarn I think, Sir, that their yarn quality leaves much to be desired. Control will have to be exercised over production of the right type of yarn so that handloom weaver does not experience any difficulty in the matter of getting correct quality of yarn through his co-operative society. With regard to the 1½ per cent, handicap that I referred to earlier as regards coarse and medium cloth this can be overcome in my opinion by subsidising in the matter of the yarn to be supplied to the handloom weaver, and unless some such step of that nature is taken it would be difficult to market about 800 million yards of coarse and medium cloth which the handloom weaver still has to produce. If the yarn required for weaving the 800 million yards of coarse and medium cloth is supplied at a subsidised rate at 7½ per cent, in my opinion, it comes to 31 crores and this amount should be earmarked for that purpose, namely for supplying yarn at a subsidised rate to the weavers. This plus the amounts that would be required for the other objects mentioned in Clause 4 of the Bill would come to 54 crores or say 6 crores of rupees. So, Sir, 3 crores of rupees should be set aside for giving coarse and medium yarn at subsidised rate to the handloom weaver. It is also necessary to see that the cost of production of the coarse and medium varieties is not such as to increase the price of coarse and medium cloth which the consumer will have to pay, because coarse and medium cloth is bought mainly by the lower income groups. No step should be taken by government which would affect the lower income groups in this regard. At present there is an excise duty on coarse and medium cloth. I think there is also the sales tax on coarse and medium cloth. According to this Bill there will be another excise duty at the rate of 3 pies per yard. All these burdens on the tax-payer. In my opinion, Sir, this 12½ per cent, burden

which is levied on the mill cloth is also too heavy for the consumer and this burden should be lightened if possible. How to lighten them? Because, the lower income groups must have their cloth at the cheapest price. My suggestion is that coarse and medium cloth should be divided into two categories—utility and non-utility cloth. There are ways of doing it—say by demarcating certain qualities which will bear higher tax and certain qualities which will bear no tax. The original excise tax, the present tax and sales tax should not operate on utility cloth which is worn by the lower income groups and the lower income groups are at present bearing 12½ per cent, and it should not be so. Then there are certain non-utility-cloth in coarse and medium varieties which are used by the middle income groups or higher income groups which can very well bear some additional burden and I say the law of diminishing returns has to be seen also. If we raise the burden too much, the law of diminishing return will operate. I can assure the hon. Minister that even on the present burden, the industry in fine and super-fine is making fantastic profits and I think if we analyse the balance sheet of those mills, the proof of my statement will be found. So some additional burdens may be shifted to fine and super-fine without the law of diminishing returns operating. Then the coarse and medium cloth should be divided between utility and non-utility cloth, and what is non-utility cloth? Shirtings can be so considered for the middle or for higher income groups. There are certain types of sarees, coatings etc. which the poor man or cultivator does not usually wear and if these varieties are separated the additional burden may be levelled on such varieties, and the varieties worn by the poor may be exempted. I have suggested ways to utilize Rs. 3 crores which amount has to be subsidised for coarse and medium yarn.

Then there has been great objections raised against reservation of 60 per

cent, for *dhoties* from mill production. With regard to that, I may say that that step was taken in a little hasty manner in order to satisfy the Hand-loom interests because the Handloom Industry cannot immediately supply the full requirement. This measure was enacted overnight and put into operation. What happened? That hand-loom Industry takes months in order to have full production of dhotis and they require yarn to be supplied, etc. All these matters have to be arranged and unless all these are done, the dhotis cannot be supplied in full by the Handloom Industry. I may say that the Handloom industry can cope with the demand of dhotis but some time was required while this was done over night. There was not sufficient mill cloth of dhoti in stock and the stock was exhausted within two months. Unless and until the production of dhotis by handlooms increases twice or thrice, they will not be able to cope with the demand. Whatever we may do, the Handloom price is more and the Handloom weavers also cannot do the processing at cheaper rates with the result that the price of handloom cloth is more. This disadvantage has to be removed. This reduction of dhoti mill cloth should have been made in a progressive manner— say every month 5 per cent, so that at the end of a few months this could have been done fully. Even when these reservations are given, they should have been viewed in a different light because even if the mills produce dhotis to the extent of 60 per cent, and the handlooms 40 per cent., the mills get an advantage of about 15 per cent, in cost. I think the cess could have been levied on the dhotis produced by mills and that cess could have been added to this fund. What dictates the price is what is the lowest strata of supply and the lower strata of supply comes from the Hand-loom Industry. It is the handloom cloth that determines the price of mill-made cloth and therefore our cess from dhotis will have been quite adequate or will have quite justified itself in the matter of production of dhotis. I

say this reduction should have been done in a period of 12 months in a progressive way so that the supply which was reduced by the mills would be met by the increased production of handloom.

With regard to the other points, I may mention what controls are at present existing on the spinning and weaving industry in the matter of extension of installations of certain machineries. Shri Deoki Nandan said that so many mills have risen. But licenses for looms are not given to mills and the spinning mills have been installed in backward areas or under developed areas where there is necessity for them and there is every justification for developing the spinning industry in the backward areas because yarn is necessary in those areas. Government have laid down a policy that 25 per cent, of yarn for spindles installed is to be given for handlooms by the new spinning mills. By this the extension of loom is practically prevented. With regard to centres for spinning, it is given on a condition that the location is to be approved and the industry is not concentrated. Therefore the new spinning mills that have developed have mostly developed in the backward areas and under developed areas.

With regard to looms, the old composite mills are not allowed to install any more looms. That is the present position under the Cotton Control Act which is operating. Therefore the Mill industry will be able to produce only to the extent of 5000 million yards and the rest of production required in the country owing to increased standard of living or owing to the increased demand will now be met by the Handloom industry. That is the policy at present followed and I think the Handloom Board is sitting and I am sure, they will not make any recommendation which will go to increase the number of looms in the mills. Therefore the problem of looms and spinning installation is well handled by the Government to the benefit of the Handloom Industry. I may also point out to the hon. Minister that there are some mills in the country which work looms three shift-

[Shri C. P. Parikh.] and such looms are about 15,000. I think it is not necessary to run these looms in the mills in three shifts because that will be taking away the employment from so many people who may be employed in the handlooms. We may allow this in case of mills which were so working in 1939 but not in all the rest of the mills. This restriction is desirable in the larger interests of the country, for we should remember that the unemployment problem is very acute in the country. Of course the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry is handling the whole problem most effectively and is taking such measures as will tend to have this desired effect. He has also laid his firm hands on the import and export policy of the country with a view to developing the industries, old and new, as much as possible. The Minister for Commerce and Industry is indirectly responsible for the general progress of the country; indeed his portfolio is as important as the Defence portfolio is in times of war. There is economic warfare in the country and I am sure the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry is quite alive to it and he is taking all the necessary measures. He speaks little but he does more. All the measures he has enacted so far will prove that he is taking such steps as will tend towards general progress. He proceeds gradually, for he does not want to run and tumble down. I congratulate him on the steps that he has already taken.

The textile industry, it seems, has represented to the hon. Minister that the burdens placed on it are too heavy; and I agree with him that this burden is not too heavy. If we analyse the profits made by the industry during the last five years, we find that these profits are quite reasonable and in some cases they are fantastic. Such profits should not be allowed to be earned. The claim made by the industry that they bear the additional burden of Rs. 55 crores in the form of increased cost is not tenable. If all this Rs. 55 crores is borne by the industry, then how does it continue

to make such profits? All that burden that is put on the industry is transferred on to the consumer. I say all this burden of Rs. 55 crores is indirectly transferred to the consumers and the consumers are bearing it for the greater benefit of the people in our country. The present Ministry by these measures and also by the measures adumbrated in the Planning Commission are trying to solve the unemployment problem and bring about agricultural and industrial development in our country. It is indeed a huge task to solve the unemployment problem. The textile industry should bear in mind that if the purchasing power of our millions is increased, then their industry will survive and progress. That is what we should now aim at. Government is committed to the creation of a classless society, to the elimination of the exploitation of the many by a few. I seriously urged, when I was in charge of the affairs of our association, not to make any representation which would not be accepted; but since that time, they have started sending wires to the Minister and this does not serve their cause; on the contrary it creates a feeling that the textile industry is the most vocal element in the land. The hand-loom industry, we must remember, has for the first time asserted its voice. I thank the hon. Minister for the aid of Rs. 6 crores envisaged by him and I hope, if necessary, he will supply more funds. This is a sign that democratic principles are spreading in the country.

Lastly I come to the question of the khadi industry. Before I speak on that, however, I have to say that in the matter of allocation of funds to the various Provinces, there will be provincial jealousies and in order to remove such jealousies, the number of handlooms earmarked for each State should be referred to and the funds allocated in that proportion. Secondly, in the definition it is said that a handloom industry is one that is run by manual labour. With mechanisation and easy supply of electric power,

it will be difficult to arrest the indiscriminate use of such power by the handloom industry in the country. In 1939 there were only 21 lakh hand-looms in the country. But with the war and the greater profits that were being made, mushroom handlooms grew up and the number came to 28 lakhs. You should carefully analyse what are the working looms and then the subsidy or help should be given at the available rate according to the funds.

I may also add that at present there (is restriction on the installation of power looms and power looms at present operate to the extent of 25,000; 13,000 being in Bombay and the others are spread all over the country. At present the Textile Commissioner has reserved power not to have additional power looms installed in the country. I think the Handloom Board also will recommend that no more power looms should be installed in the country. We should not give power to handlooms in order that they may weave 20 to 50 yds. instead of 9 yds. If all the 21 lakh looms convert themselves into power looms, then it will be difficult. The present restriction on power looms should also be there because we have the unemployment problem in the country and unless and until we give employment to everyone of our people we should not adopt mechanisation methods. After all, unless we solve the problem of unemployment no democracy or no political power can hope to function. Therefore it is necessary to see that we do not adopt mechanisation methods which may create unemployment to a serious degree

Lastly I come to the khadi industry on which I think the hon. Member, Shri Deokinandan Narayan spoke so much. Generally in well-made charkas one man can attend to 10 spindles while one man in a mill can attend to 800 spindles, and his wage is Rs. 125. In 90 per cent. of mills in India, each man minds 408 spindles and the production is 200 lbs. Therefore one man in the

spinning mill is producing 100 -times more yarn than the man who is spinning at a charka or ten spindles. But he is not to be obliterated; he has to live. The question of wages in spinning is most important and most material, and the hand spinning industry cannot by itself stand on its own. It has to live and those who put on khadi pay the price. They pay the price but they can pay it to a certain extent.

Sir, they are following the gospel of Gandhiji because he said that we want to give employment to the millions of our people and so long as there are many unemployed or semi-employed or disguisedly employed, we have to go on and cannot disturb the rural arrangement whatever the cost may be. I have seen, in my tours in one of the Committees on which I was appointed that people were clamouring for jobs on Rs. 5 per month for hand spinning and as long as people are clamouring for work at the rate of Rs. 5 or Rs. 7 then, naturally, unless and until we provide additional employment for them or alternative employment for them, the States have to see that their interests are safeguarded. The Minister for Industries also is responsible for the unemployment and, therefore, he has taken this measure for supporting khadi. Let us see how this two crores of rupees will be utilised. The aspiration is to produce 100 million yards khadi and if three annas is given we will require a crore and half and khadi cloth will sell very well and will also give employment to the millions in this country who require part employment or who will be satisfied with Rs. 5 or Rs. 8 per month. Therefore, I say, Sir, that this is more an unemployment dole which is given. If that is not done and if it is not given in the right spirit, then, Sir, we shall have to devise other measures. We cannot deny those who want to work for eight hours the right to work or those who want work at the rate of Rs. 5 or Rs. 7 per month. If this new experiment proves successful and if the unemploy-

[Shri C. P. Parikh.] ment is reduced, we have helped the khadi industry although such help will be at the expense of others; otherwise the question of unemployment will remain most acute and no political power will be able to continue.

With these words. Sir, I resume my seat.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is good that at long last the Government has realised the need for protecting khadi and handloom industries but the measure that has been brought before us has a very limited scope and I believe that it does not go very far so far as this problem is concerned. Sir, if we realise that in our own economy this khadi and handloom has a definite place then we have to make up our mind as to how and in how many years we are going to see that this industry is fairly established in this country. In this Bill, we will get some money by levying a cess on the mill made cloth but the erores of rupees would be spent, as the Minister has already indicated in subsidising the handloom and khadi industries. At present the khadi and handloom products does not find any market and the prices of these products are so very high that they are not sold in the market. Now. it is proposed to give some subsidies. I understand previously some State Governments also encouraged khadi industry by giving subsidies but it failed to achieve its purpose. Therefore. I think that the Government should make up its own mind before coming up to the House like this and bring forward Bills which do not solve the problem at all. It is merely, I would say, tinkering with the problem. They must say whether this Bill, this measure is just a first step to see that in this country, ultimately, khadi and handloom Industry would have a monopoly and that cloth and mill-made products would be gradually eliminated or do we visualise that in a number of years we will only have khadi and handloom for our home consumption? We can-

„ not have this both ways.
11 A.M. T., . . . ”

If we go on giving licenses for new power looms, capital gets locked up unless of course this is only meant for export. I think if competition is allowed between khadi and handloom products and the millmade products, the handloom industry would never be encouraged and would remain as it is today. So, I would feel that there must be restriction placed on the consumption, of millmade cloth and the millmade products should be meant for export only. Is the Government prepared to announce that as the production of handloom increases they would atleast be prepared to restrict the mill-weaving for home consumption? Unless some such policy is announced. I do not think this Bill is going to serve any purpose. Sir, today we find large amount of khadi stocks lying unsold; it is because it has a high price and also because the demand in the country is not so very great as it was before. Khadi was introduced into our country by Mahatma Gandhi: it has a philosophy behind it. The Government always swears in the name of Gandhi but I do not know whether they are prepared to accept the very philosophy of decentralisation which signifies khadi as a whole. Today we find that the Congress Party has made it a rule that the Members of that Party must wear khadi.

SIHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): You may also wear.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY : I wear khadi regularly; I am a khadi wearer and I am proud of it but I find today that khadi is associated more or less with blackmarketing and profiteering. Sir, one is looked upon with suspicion when one goes to the people with khadi because it has lost its grace and honour. Khadi was used in this country as a national symbol of sacrifice and suffering but what do we find today? We find a party which makes it compulsory that its Members must wear khadi and in the Government sphere what does it do? It plays with the sentiments of the people, pays lip

service by saying that we will encourage khadi etc. Therefore, I say that you must have a definite policy as to what you are going to do. Unless that is done, you will get some money, as the hon. Minister has already said, and that will be given as grants to the States who have their own Departments. I know of my own State where the Khadi Department has been opened since many years. There, money, I would say, is being spent to provide employment for some Congress Workers who, I can claim to say, have no belief in khadi. These workers are utilised for election purposes and they become another Election Department of the Government concerned. So, by getting more money and distributing it like this through the States, I don't think that the khadi industry or handloom industry is going to be helped. Sir, the unemployment problem is another problem has been specifically mentioned. The Minister has stated and it is also stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that employment is to be given. Today, there is no doubt that a very large number of people were kept employed by khadi industry but it is known also that the income per capita in these industries is very low. This income has to be increased if we want the standard of living of the people to be raised. This can be done only, in my opinion, if improved methods of manufacture is introduced by which this per *capita* income could be increased under village conditions.

So it will be better if Government directed the technical departments to devise some methods as to see that the method of production is improved. And even if you have some plan, I think some other processes must also be taken, some other methods must also be applied to see that the people are more encouraged to take Khadi. The Government Departments themselves should purchase Khadi and products of handloom industries and nothing else. I think if that is done, the khadi and the handloom industry would not suffer on account of want of market. That is the first step that

Government should take. Khadi, instead of being a party dress which is associated with Government and which becomes a licence to get permits and other things, should be treated and recognised as the national dress of our country because in the national revolution we made it the national dress. It is really a misfortune that in our country today we have no national dress so to say. We have so many varieties of dress. Let us make it a point, if we are really sincere about it, that we recognise khadi alone as the national dress of India and nothing else. If you proceed in this manner, then only your sincerity can be tested. Therefore I would say that this Bill is just like other measures of Government which come one after another without any policy whatsoever. It is just to satisfy this section or that section. There are people who are associated with the khadi industry and there are people associated with the handloom industry. The Madras Chief Minister raised a row over it. So you have to satisfy him somehow or other. You then bring a Bill like this and try to satisfy the various sections. This is not how you are going to solve the problem. Therefore my point is that although there is nothing to oppose in this Bill—as I said earlier it is good that at long last Government has realised the need of protecting this industry—but at the same time if the sincerity of Government is to be tested, if we want to give this industry the pride of its place in the national economy of our country, we must make up our mind one way or the other; whether we are going to make it a point that as far as the cloth requirements of our country are concerned, we are not going to allow any mill made cloth to be used in this country after a particular period of time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further, I have to inform the House that we have to pass this Bill today, and I want to call upon the hon. Minister at 12-15 to reply unless the House is prepared to sit in the afternoon from 4 P.M. to 7 P.M.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: Is it necessary that it must be passed today?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, it has to be passed, because the Notification expires tomorrow and Government will not be able to collect taxes.

PROF. G. RANGA: That is before the end of tomorrow, is it, Sir?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: No; it expires at 12 O'clock tonight.

KHWAJA IN AIT ULLAH: It means that now we cannot move any amendments because there will be no time to send it to the other House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amendments will be considered on their merits.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: We can meet in the afternoon if it is necessary.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is it the sense of the House?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN (Madras) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Minister for Industries deserves our congratulations for bringing this Bill before the House at least in this session. Sir, I know that all of us are interested and sincere in the matter and that all of us sympathise with the suffering handloom weavers and khadi workers. He was not able to bring this measure before the House much earlier, but still. Sir, the vested interests seem to have yielded and popular opinion has once again asserted and we are thankful to the hon. Minister for having piloted this measure in this House.

Sir, this is a measure which should have been supported by all sections of the people, both inside and outside the House but today, Sir, the opposition seems to come not from any political party, not from any politically organised body, not from the people of the country, not from the toilers of the country, not from the common man of the country, but from the mill-owners, vested interests and managing agents.

SHRI S. N. DWIVEDY: The Congress Party, you mean?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: The Socialist Party. If members want, I shall name them. Sir, the vested interests are the least qualified persons to talk about the common man and the consumers, but today instead of having their ground on the firm principles of taxation or on the merits of the question, they have pleaded against this Bill in a very dilatory manner. Sir, I should like to assure the hon. Members who are supporting the managing agents and the millowners that the people of India, the people of this country, especially the masses, are prepared to suffer this much of taxation for the benefit of their brothers who are suffering in the handloom and khadi industry, so their argument does not hold good. This measure is welcome, Sir, though I feel that the i anna per yard is a concession that has been given to the millowner. The mill industry is very rich and it can stand even two or three annas from the large capital that they have accumulated. The hon. Minister to satisfy the industry has agreed to levy only i anna per yard, but I feel this will not be sufficient. Even if it had been increased to one anna per yard, still the industry would have been able to bear it and the people of the country would have willingly given their contribution towards the maintenance of the suffering handloom weavers and khadi weavers. Sir, today, the mill industry which is the most flourishing industry in this country is against this Bill, but the irony of fate is that it was the spirit of nationalism, the feeling of nationalism that was capitalised by the mill industry. When Gandhiji started in 1920 the 'Buy Swadeshi' movement, the Indian khadi movement, the mill industry took up the slogan very earnestly and they said: 'Buy Indian; buy mill made products'. If we go through the past few years we can see how the mill industry has prospered, how they have cornered all the trade in the country and have also captured overseas markets within the last 20 to 30 years. It is

because of the spirit of nationalism of the people, it is because of the 'Buy Swadeshi' movement that was launched by Gandhiji and the Congress that the mill industry is in the unenviable position in which it is today and therefore they should be the last persons to oppose this Bill.

Sir, I was surprised when one of the Members who is a leading mill industrialist said that the handloom industry cannot cope up with the demand of the public. He was making a reference to the reservation of dhotis and sarees to the handloom industry and he was saying that the handloom trade cannot rise to the occasion and meet the needs of the people. I would like to remind him to look in to the past—not the very distant past, but the recent past. Sir, till the 17th or 18th century India was the greatest exporter of textiles to the whole world and Indian calico was the greatest flair of English men and women. And in England they had to pass a resolution against the import of Indian calico into England. It is of course past history. Then came the East India Company and they systematically killed the handloom industry. They did it with an intention—supporting and making Manchester live. The first Indian mill was not built till the end of the 19th century: even then only spinning mills were built, in India and they were operated for the benefit and well being of the handloom weavers. In the beginning of the 20th century the weaving section came into prominence. I should like to remind hon. Members that up to 1914 *sarees* and dhotis were the exclusive monopoly of the handloom industry. When the first world war came, imports dwindled and the mill industry wanted to take advantage of it and switched over to *sarees* and dhotis. As a result from 1914 onwards the mills came into direct conflict with the handloom industry and today the mill industry is prospering while the handloom industry has gone down. During 1914, both the mill and the handloom industry produced 200 erores yards of cloth equally between them. In the

war period, that is 1914 to 1920, the mill industry made huge progress and increased its production by about 60 per cent, and consequently the hand-loom industry had to reduce its production by about 50 per cent. The handloom industry was however able to survive and between 1920 and 1939 the handloom industry was able to pick up again and at the end of 1939 the handloom industry was able to produce 170 erores yards of cloth. Then came the greatest blessing for the Indian mill industry—the Second World War, and the mill industry minted erores of money. Everybody knows that during the war years the Indian mills made enormous profits, huge profits, unthinkable profits. During the period 1939-49 the mills worked three shifts and they were able to produce 300 to 400 crore yards a year, and India became an exporter of textiles after a lapse of centuries. In 1950 the handloom industry suffered a setback. The production again fell. Official statistics show that out of a total production of 600 crore yards, 160 crore yards were produced by hand-looms and the rest by the mills. At present, out of 144 crore pounds of yarn produced by the spinning mills, only 70,000 bales are allotted to the handloom industry and the rest are either utilised by the weaving mills or allowed to be exported from this country. It comes to 280 lakh pounds. There has been a cry that the hand-loom industry has not been able to satisfy the needs of the people. But it is interesting to note that the hand-loom industry has been practically killed and mutilated by the mill-owners. If the handloom industry is given sufficient yarn. I can assure the hon. Members of this House that they will be able to produce all required varieties, and even all the cloth that is needed in the country. A brief reference to facts and figures will convince the House of my point of view. In 1908, 850 lakh pounds of yarn was consumed by the weaving mills, whereas the handlooms consumed 200 crore pounds. In 1915, 2,460 lakh pounds were consumed by the weaving mills, while handlooms were consuming

[Shri T. S. Pattabiraman.] 2,727 lakh pounds. In 1952 the progress is reversed. In 1952, the weaving mills were consuming 8,350 lakh pounds whereas the handlooms were given 3,250 lakh pounds only. This clearly goes to show that the handloom industry has been practically killed by the Indian mill industry, because the entire yarn output is being taken away from the handloom industry and the mill industry is able to survive. If the handloom industry is given adequate yarn, it will be able to produce more cloth that will be satisfying to the country.

Another point was raised, that the textile industry will be ruined and lakhs of labourers will be affected. In the whole country there are, as we know, 425 spinning and weaving mills, and the Dower looms are about 2 lakhs. The total spindleage of all these mills is 10,40,00,000. The total labour employed in all these mills is 5 lakhs, whereas on a modest estimate based on the 1948 census there are 25 lakh handlooms in India and the entire labour employed in them and dependent on them is 2 crores. Is it good economy to sacrifice 2 crores of people and make them live in fear of starvation and unemployment, so that 5 lakhs of people may live? If you want the 2 crores of people dependent on this industry to live, you must pay them a decent wage, and they must be given full employment. I do not even want full employment for them they must be at least employed for 20 days in a month. They must have at least 750 lakh pounds of yarn per month. That will come to 90 crore pounds every year. If that is made available to the handlooms, a great stride can be made towards the fulfilment of the promise that the handloom industry will be able to serve the people.

Now, Sir, coming to the grant, I must say that Madras is deeply disappointed at the meagre allocation. Out of the Rs. 6 crores, only Rs. 125 lakhs is to be given to Madras State.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Who said that? Government have com-

mitted themselves to no State with regard to any amount to be distributed.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I will not proceed on any assumption but I will make a particular request. Out of the 25 lakh handlooms in India, more than 8 lakhs are in Madras and whatever may be the allocation, Madras State must be able to get one-third of the Rs. 6 crores. I am sure that Madras will be given just treatment in the matter of the allocation.

With regard to the spending of the Fund, I must say that money from this fund should not be given to individual weavers but must be spent for the benefit of the entire handloom industry. Whatever may be the defects of the co-operative societies, that must be the only medium. It should be possible to organise the weavers into co-operative societies, and put every rupee, every anna and every pie intended for the benefit of handloom weavers should be spent through co-operative societies. The first problem is to give the weavers adequate quantities of yarn. For the supply of yarn the weavers should not have to depend on the spinning mills. They must have their own co-operative spinning mills. In Madras State, the Provincial Co-operative Society has already started two or three mills and they are supplying yarn through their own mills to the weavers. Provision must be made out of this fund for starting two or three more mills by co-operative societies.

Marketing is essential—marketing inside India and outside India. A better organisation should be set up for marketing of handloom products both in India and abroad.

Finally, I want to say a word about khadi. There has been much criticism about khadi. Some people find philosophy in khadi, and some people have subjected it to criticism. Some people are afraid of khadi: khadi is to them like a red rag to a bull—it scares them. Anybody who has used khadi will tell you that it is the most

practical aspect of communism expounded by Karl Marx. One of the fundamental principles of communism is the theory of surplus value. Out of every rupee paid for khadi, 15J annas go to the producer who produces khadi. Actually the economic aspect of khadi is the practical utilisation of the communist principle. Gandhiji had a different opinion about the political philosophy of communism, but he was the first to introduce the economic principle of communism through khadi. and I am sure the failure of khadi will be the failure of communism in the world. I am sure khadi will receive every encouragement and help from the people in the country. Unless the rural people survive, unless they are able to get a decent wage, unless they are able to live a decent life, it will not be in our own interests. It will not be in our interests to see them suffer for a long time. While I support this measure. I hope that this will not be an end in itself. I hope this measure is the beginning of a great era. The hon. Minister knows what has been the suffering of the handloom weavers in Madras State. During the last six years, they have been neglected, they have been forgotten, they have not been given justice. Today, in the district of Salem, which is an important handloom centre, thousands of families of handloom weavers have taken to begging. They have left their homes and they have been living as displaced persons. So, if the hon. Minister is serious about helping the handloom industry, he must be able to make reservation of certain varieties for the handlooms and give them all facilities and protection, as has been very ably suggested by the Madras Legislature, which consisting of various political parties, unanimously made a proposal in the form of a resolution in favour of such reservation, and I am sure that this Government, which has at heart, the well being of all the people of this country, will take effective steps to implement the recommendation as regards reservation.

SF" T F. *T. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Bill

before us deals only with khadi and the handloom industry, but it raises a question of great practical importance. The object of the Bill. I suppose, is to prevent unemployment.....

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: To mitigate unemployment.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Well, I accept the amendment suggested by my hon. friend Shri T. T. Krishnamachari. The object of the Bill is to mitigate unemployment.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: But the hon. Minister said in the other House that it was a taxation measure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: If the object is to mitigate unemployment, there are other industries also which deserve attention in this connection. The handloom industry may be the largest cottage industry in the country, but the other industries, taken together, also provide employment to a large number of people. And the leather industry comes only next to the hand-loom industry in importance. But the Government although it must have been conscious of the fact that it was raising a question of great importance, has remained studiously silent on the subject. The Planning Commission dealt with this question in its Report. It said:

"One principal objective of policy is to provide for each cottage industry a field within which it may operate in an organised manner. Wherever a large scale industry competes with the cottage industry, a common production programme should be formulated so that gradually the two become closely integrated."

Now the Planning Commission does show that it had to deal with the subject comprehensively. Government have generally accepted the Commission's Report, but under the Bill before us, they propose to take action only with regard to one industry. Now, Sir, so far as the handloom in-

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.] dustry is concerned, all the facts regarding it will be known only when the Textile Inquiry Board appointed by the Minister for Commerce and Industry presents its report. I do not know when its report will be received. But it is clear, Sir, that however expeditiously the Board may work, as it will be making a comprehensive survey of the entire textile industry in the country, it will take some time to submit its report to the Government.

Then as regards khadi, the Planning Commission said:

"Certain tentative proposals had been prepared, but they will have to be considered by the proposed Khadi and Village Industries Board."

' This Board has been set up, but I do not know whether it has submitted any recommendations to Government. I suppose it has not. Otherwise my hon. friend Shri T. T. Krishnamachari would not have failed to refer to them. The position, therefore, is, Sir, that even with regard to khadi and the handloom industry, Government is taking action without having the report of the Textile Inquiry Board or the Khadi and Village Industries Board before it. Why has the Government been in such a hurry then to bring forward this Bill? It seems to me, Sir, that this is due to the pressure exercised by the Madras Government. A Resolution was passed by the Madras Assembly on the 4th November urging the reservation of border dhotis and coloured *sarees* for the handloom weaving industry. Now my hon. friend Shri T. T. Krishnamachari made it clear soon after this resolution was passed that he regarded as utterly impracticable that the entire production referred to in the resolution passed by the Madras Assembly should be reserved for the handloom industry. But the fact that action has been taken by Government without having before them the data on which they could base their considered conclusions showed that action has been taken^s owing to political pressure.

This is what creates the suspicion that the Bill has a political motive behind it and that it will be used for political purposes. My hon. friend Shri T. T. Krishnamachari has not denied that this Bill may serve a political purpose, but he has denied that Government had any political object in bringing forward the provisions of the Bill in a political spirit. Sir, I do not want to attach no value to the assurance given by the Minister for Commerce and Industry, but taking the facts as they are and the entire position into consideration, I think, I shall not be far wrong in saying that in his heart of hearts he too realises that the Bill is, in substance, a political measure. I wish, Sir, he were more free to speak out his mind today than he is. and had he had full freedom—the freedom that he had a few months ago—I am sure, he would have sided with us in this matter. Sir, the position of the Madras Government, has already been strengthened by the removal of all controls on food and I suppose that the partial acceptance of the Resolution passed by the Madras Assembly will further strengthen the position of the Madras Government.

Now, Sir, another question of great importance on which I have to ask the Minister for Commerce and Industry to throw light is this. Had the Bill been confined to Madras, its consideration at this stage might have been adequately justified. But it is well-known, Sir, that the handloom industry especially occupies a very important position in that State in regard to the production of dhotis and *sarees*. We are all familiar, Sir, that dhoties and *sarees* are often produced on the handloom in Madras, but can my hon. friend, the Minister for Commerce and Industry, tell us—assure us—that the position is the same in every other State?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY-. In most of the Southern States.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Well, the South does not constitute the whole of India. There are other States too

and this Bill does not relate only to Madras or to the Southern States. It relates to the whole of India. I have therefore every right to enquire what the effect of this Bill will be on Northern India—on the Punjab, the UP., Bihar and West Bengal. In the Punjab there is hardly any production of the kind desired to be encouraged. There is some objection of that kind in the U.P. and in Bengal.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI:
 What about Bihar?

SHRI H. N. KUNGRU: I am not aware; I did not refer to Bihar because I was not aware of the position there. But the position in none of these States is the same as in Madras. What justification then can Government give for applying a measure which may be justifiable in the case of Madras to other States where the position is very different? The rigid application of this measure may produce a shortage of dhotis in these States. The Bill, as the Commerce and Industry Minister said, is not a temporary measure, intended to give an opportunity of watching its effect on the supply of dhotis in the various States. It is a permanent measure. If it is found—and it seems likely that it will be found—not to meet the needs of certain States it will have to be amended. This again shows that the Bill is a hasty and ill-considered measure which has been brought up. If it has been brought up now it cannot be said with any justification that this has been done on purely economic grounds. The Government passed an order, sometime ago, under the Essential Supplies Act, restricting the production of dhotis in mills to 60 per cent, of the existing production and they did so without taking into consideration the question whether handlooms will be able to produce within a short time what the mills were producing. I am no advocate of the mills, be it noted. Sir, I should like the economic condition of the people to be improved by cottage industries where they can be effi-

ciently run and economically maintained. I should be in favour even of supporting cottage industries which are not wholly economic as a temporary measure in order to give the Government some time to consider the whole situation and decide how the workers engaged in these industries may be transferred to other industries, whether existing or new. But my hon. friend Shri T. T. Krishnamachari was absolutely silent on this point. He dealt with other questions, for instance, parliamentary control over the proceeds of the cess, which was wholly unnecessary. Even the latest Member of this House knows that the control of Parliament over the disposal of money is complete. He should have dealt with other questions, for instance, those that I have referred to. But while dealing with some unnecessary questions he maintained silence with regard to the Questions which it was necessary for him to answer.....

Sir, the position of the handloom industry has not come to the knowledge of the Government for the first time. Various Committees have considered the position of this industry in a number of States more than once during the last twenty five years and I believe that all of them have pointed out that this industry can be strengthened only if attention is paid to certain essential conditions relating to training, better designing, research, marketing, the formation of co-operative societies and so on. Now these questions have not been solved yet. Does my hon. friend Shri T. T. Krishnamachari propose to solve them in the course of a few months or even a year or two? The question even of the formation of co-operative societies is a large one. It will take a long time. Even the most ardent supporters of Khadi and hand-loom industry will not assert that this problem can be dealt with in a year or two. There is again the question of better training and research which has been referred to by the Planning Commission. The Commission observed "while it is essential that rural industry should receive

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.] support and assistance from the State Governments this will have only a short-term value unless in the meantime there is a rapid improvement in the technique of production. The utmost importance must. " therefore be attached to research and training in village industries. A scheme for a central institute for research should be worked out by the proposed Khadi & Village Industries Board". And this Board has either yet to consider the smbject carefully or to submit its recommendations to Government.

I have referred to these things, Sir, only in order to show that the passage of the Bill before us—which is certain—will not solve the problem that it relates to. Nothing would have been lost had the introduction of this Bill been postponed for a few months. For, we would then have been able to act with better knowledge and we would probably have been able to take systematic measures in order to achieve the object in view.

I have so far referred to the handloom industry which is not depend ent on hand-spun yarn. I would like now to refer very briefly to the production of khadi. We don't know what the production of hand-spun yarn or khadi is. nor did the Minis ter for Commerce and Industry give us any figures

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: 160 million yards.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: With regard to either of these things. My hon. friend Shri B. C. Ghose says that the total production amounts to 160 million yards.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: 19.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I don't know what the production is. It was the duty of the hon. Minister when he explained the Bill to Us to tell us the existing position of khadi which he is anxious to help. He proposes to devote as much money to the production of khadi as to the other handloom industry. Now what is the justification of this? There may be

some justification for it but the Minister for Commerce and Industry has not given it. He should have known that there is general ignorance with regard to khadi. He should therefore have told us what its existing position was, to what extent it could be encouraged and how Govr-ernment proposed to achieve this object. He has merely asked us to pass a measure which will help fchodi and the other handloom industries. I ask him to tell us honestly whether he thinks that the information that he has given us is sufficient to justify us in accepting this measure. I am not at all against giving help to cottage industries, least of all to weavers but surely, before we are asked to embark on a project with such wide implications, we should have been given full information in order to enable us to know whether the policy that we were pursuing was right and calculated to yield the desired result within a measurable distance of time. I fear that however quickly the House may pass tb's measure, it will take Government long to bring about the changes referred to in the report of the Planning Commission and it must be remembered that unless these developments occur, no amount of artificial support can place the handloom industry on a stable basis. Help the industry by all means but not in a sentimental way. Help it in a scientific way so that it may be able to maintain its position hereafter. We are asked to pass this Bill today because the notification under the Provisional Collection of- Taxes Act which is enabling the Government tn collect the cess proposed in the Bill in anticipation of its existence by Parliamnt would come to an end today. I have already said that the Government have brought forward this Bill in great haste. But even so I think it is pertinent to ask Government whether there was any need for beginning the collection of this cess from the day the Bill was placed becv ■^re the House of the People. Had the mills gone on making dhotis for a short time more, I am sure that the

position of the handloom weavers would not have been seriously affected thereby. The passage of this Bill will not improve it immediately and its postponement for a few months would not have injured it materially.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: Only a loss of a couple of crores!

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: The Government don't propose to spend the entire money in the first year itself. They have got no schemes which will justify the expenditure of Rs. 5 to 6 crores. All that they propose is to set apart a crore for the assistance and encouragement of khadi and a crore for the support of the rest of the handloom industry. It is a matter of regret to me that Government should have brought so important a "Bill without giving it that consideration which its importance deserved. It is further a matter of deep regret to me that they have said nothing with regard to the action that they proposed to take in regard to the other cottage industries mentioned in the Planning Commission's report. In view of the importance of the leather industry in the U.P. I am specially interested in it. If my hon. friend Shri T. T. Krishnamachari thought of his State when he drafted this Bill, he should at any rate in his speech have referred to some cottage industries which were of importance for other States. I hope that even now Government will tell us what they propose to do with regard to the other cottage industries dealt with by the Planning Commission particularly with the leather industry. Unless they have a well considered and comprehensive scheme referring to all these industries, it will be difficult, let me say again, to avoid the suspicion that the Bill before us is much more a political one than an economic measure.

PROF. N. R. MALKANI (Nominated) : Sir, I welcome the introduction of the Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development Bill. This is a short Bill. But to my mind it is a very significant Bill. I say so advisedly, because if you read the Statement of Objects and Reasons, you

will find there Government making an important announcement of policy. It says: "Both khadi and the hand-loom cloth industry have a definite place in our national economy." This is the first time that the Government have made a definite statement of its policy in this connection. But I feel that the statement is a little weak and half-hearted. The statement made of this policy in the Five Year Plan is more vigorous and more outspoken. It says: "These village industries are a very important and integral part of the national economy." Our Prime Minister went one better when he addressed the Khadi Board and said that these village industries had a central place in rural development. I wish these words were reproduced exactly in this Statement of Objects and Reasons. They are more vigorous, more outspoken and that is the way to make a statement of policy.

I should thank the Chief Minister of Madras—they may be political or other reasons—for bringing this matter before the Indian public and giving it the importance that it should have. I am not concerned with political moves. But I am concerned with very important matters of policy. This Bill is important also because in the Statement of Objects and Reasons it says: "Khadi makes its contribution"—and khadi here includes other cottage industries also—"Khadi makes its contribution towards the relief of rural unemployment". This to my mind is a very quiet, a very mild statement and to my mind, it should have been a more forthright statement. We are dealing with the question of unemployment. We have not only to reduce unemployment, not only to work for the mitigation of unemployment, but also to abolish unemployment altogether. And that is a very important feature for us. That is why I thank the Chief Minister of Madras. He did a great service by bringing before us this very important problem of unemployment, not only in his province but all over the country. As far as I know there are today about 3 million handloom workers in the

[Prof. N. R. Malkan] country working whole-time or part-time. Very few of them are fully employed and by bringing this problem before us the Chief Minister of Madras has done us a great service. It was only due to the slump, it was only due to the fall in prices that the problem of handloom industry has come before us. I feel this important subject should have come before us much earlier. It should have come up some four years back. But better late than never.

This policy is also important because it brings up the question of full employment also. When we take the first step, then we are bound to take the other, the logical and the inevitable step soon, of resolving the question of unemployment in the country as a whole. You cannot have it half-ways. You cannot have full employment for the handloom weavers and not for the whole country. So far as I am aware, in the country there is only 60 per cent, employment and in a population of 36 crores, if you take full employment into consideration, it is a very huge problem, and 12 NOON I want the hon. Minister to recognise it and not be apologetic about it. This Bill is the first step and a very important step in the right direction. Once you take that step, once you talk of mitigating unemployment, I will say that is not enough; you must abolish unemployment altogether. It is not enough giving full employment to handloom weavers. We must proceed further and provide employment to all in the country and for this a revolutionary policy will have to be followed. I am, anyway, grateful for the Bill that is before us.

Another thing that we must recognise today is that in the country so far as the cloth industry is concerned, there are three important varieties of cloth. There is the mill-cloth, the handloom cloth and there is khadi. I take these three main ones. Let us recognise quite clearly and definitely that these three are competitors with one another, that each grows at the present moment at the cost of the

others. Sir, up till now, before Independence, I may say, the foreign mill cloth industry grew by sucking the blood of the handloom industry, by crushing it, by sitting on it. That happened for three centuries and we took it lying down and millions were reduced to utter poverty. Since the last war. I mean the Second World War, our own mill industry which was a baby industry, or rather a boy industry has become an adult and now it talks as if it is a wrestler—a *vahai-v7an*. It has come into existence only during the last ten or twelve years and it talks as if it was always strong. It was really never strong before the last war. It has become strong only now; and that too again at the cost of the cottage industry. Let us recognise that, and also that under the present conditions of competition, the handloom industry cannot flourish. Let us also recognise definitely that this industry is not only dying but it will soon be quite dead. It has to be protected and every step has got to be taken to restrain and restrict the precise area of the work of the mills by telling the mills to go so far and no farther. Let us say it quite clearly, because even today the mills are receiving protection. They get aid, advice and other things in a variety of ways even today. So far as the mill cloth industry is concerned, we give it every facility. We supply them cotton at some controlled rates. There are a number of research institutions and laboratories doing research in cotton and a variety of other things. There is the Industrial Finance Corporation and we have a number of technical and poly-technical institutions for training workers for the mills. There are dozens of ways in which* the mill industry is being assisted, financially and in other ways by the Government and the people. When I was a young boy, I started wearing mill-cloth and at the time of the Partition of Bengal, the interest grew in *swadeshi* cloth and I went in for mill cloth. I have never gone in for fine cloth in all my life and I went in for all sorts of colours—red, blue, yellow—and when I used to bring them

into the house, my mother used to throw them at my face and say, "You look a jester and not a gentleman in these colours". Even then many of us who were inspired by national sentiments were wearing that sort of cloth and the mills used to make money out of us by the ton.

It is up to them now to disgorge their evil gains because whenever we are weak, whenever there is a war, whenever there is scarcity of cloth they have not spared us and, during the war and a few years after, what was the rate for cloth that, we were paying? Today, we have imposed a small cess of three pies per yard on mill cloth. Sir, I hope you are aware that the difference in prices between khadi and mill and handloom is very considerable. The average mill cloth costs six annas per yard and I think handloom would be 7 or 7½ annas and khadi would be one rupee. How are we going to equalise this considerable difference? You are invoicing three pies per yard and mill owners call it *jezzia*. What would that be called which all these years we have been paying through our noses? Time has come to settle these things and set them straight and right. We must recognise that there must be regular areas, reserved varieties both for the mill as well as handloom and khadi. They are competing and crushing each other at present. The Bill must now prescribe and reserve and say so far and no further. I must say, Sir, that the mill cloth should as far as possible have a market abroad, and if here then mostly in towns. And I must also insist that the handloom cloth must essentially cater for the local, urban and rural markets. It is no use saying that handloom cloth can be sent to Germany or America. That market is an insecure market. Hand-looms have *no* more advantage now in the production of "patterns" and specialities. Even the mills are appointing their artists for designing patterns. People must understand that it, is not *desi* goods, it is not patterns, it is not fancy goods but mass production,

which may be dhoti, or saree, but part of mass production that must be reserved very definitely. If the hand-loom and khadi cloth has got to survive, has got to live, as it must live, it can do so only if there is mass production, that is dhotis and jsarees. How much subsidy you give to each variety or class and by what way you give is not my concern. I am not a mill owner or a business man. I am only a user and a consumer and I must say that within five years or so, the handloom industry must be put on a sound basis so as to have a definite place in the national economy; that can only be done by some mass production being reserved for the hand-loom industry.

Sir, coming to the khadi industry, I have to speak a little more humbly. My own mind is not clear; it is not yet made up. I can see that there is a problem before my eyes which I am not able to solve. I do not want to make any political use of khadi. I wear khadi and I hope I shall go on doing so until I die but I am now considering khadi on a national basis, not on a political basis. There is a big problem before us and agriculture cannot solve this problem. Even if we rationalise agriculture, intensify agriculture and have economic holdings, agriculture will hardly maintain 60 per cent, of our population. It may be less. Even now people are being thrown out of agriculture to some other industries. It is also quite clear to me that people are also being thrown out of other industries because of the industrialisation of the country. Like a parrot we go on shouting that we want more industrialisation. Are we aware that the leather industry is in pangs of agony today? It is being confronted all over by mills of Bata. There are twelve village industries and four of them are important village industries and they can give employment to **millions** of people and yet today under our very eyes, the oil pressing, the grinding, the husking industries, all these industries are being thrown out of gear, out of order and under the so-called parrot cry of in-

[Prof. N. R. Malkani.]

dustrialisation. We go on shouting about industrialisation but this is no solution at all; this is, on the contrary, making the problem far more complicated, a challenge to our very national survival. Sir, I say that there are twelve other allied industries, round about the cloth industry; they are satellites of cloth industry. They survive if cloth survives; if cloth does not survive, all the other twelve go down. There is no other alternative left for us and I must say, 'Find out a way of getting full employment'. For me, the Five Year Plan is only a chance and an opportunity to prepare for the next stage; it is to make us conscious of what we have not got and what we have got. I do not consider the Five Year Plan as very important except that it makes us conscious, puts us forward, and gives confidence to us. When we shall look at it at the end of five years the employment problem will go worse and the solution will have to be and shall have to be a revolutionary solution which will put us in the right direction. I hope the hon. Minister when he answers the question at the end of the five years will not be apologetic; and the real question has got to be answered there and it must be properly answered.

Sir, I will end by saying one word more about khadi. If we are to help it, we must help it with our eyes open: we must not forget that khadi will exist only if it is sent to villages. Unless there are village panchayats in the villages and unless khadi is handed over to them, and unless it is treated like agriculture as part of the socio-economy of the village, this khadi has no future at all. Better shut it up now. Khadi is a child, a weak child nursed by the greatest of nurses, Mahatma Gandhi. He is not with us now and the child is sick, very ill. I do feel that it must survive, it must survive as Gandhiji said in the villages as an adjunct of the village agriculture. The time taken may be five years or fifty years but that is the only way to follow. We must assure the village or the group of villages that

you have to survive not only with agriculture but with all the village industries, so this is the barrier, this is the point where the mill cloth will not come. We shall have to tell the village that no other cloth will come inside the village; only then, when they are perfectly satisfied and secure, will khadi survive. There is no other way.

There is one thing more about khadi; unless there is technical aid given but of the same quality, of the same order with the same sincerity as is given to the mills, khadi will not survive. It is a great surprise to me, Sir, that in this khadi industry, the ginning tool has improved considerably, the carding machine is good, even the loom has improved. But somehow, all the world over for 5,000 years the charkha is where it was, spinning 300 or 400 yards per hour. Sir, we should concentrate, officially and non-officially, through this Government and the people, and secure the aid of technical people in India and abroad to secure a charkha which will at least double its production, and earn a wage of As. 8 for 4 hours—for nobody spins for 8 hours a day. Today, Sir, all our research, all our technical aid is for the mills, for the big industries. If we divert it to the village industries, it will give us very good results and unless technical assistance is given and unless we are sincere about this advance, khadi will not survive.

Lastly if you want to have full employment there are several ways of achieving it—there is the way of America; there is the way of Russia and China. Even in India in the medieval times, there was full employment of a sort. Now, do we want the American system or do we want the Chinese system? Or do we want to go back 200 years to the primitive feudal system, just surviving or just existing a little above animal life? No Sir, we wish to lead a much better life and make a valuable contribution to the way of life of the world. We have got to make a special contribution and I suggest that we should not only secure full employment; man does not

live by bread alone. It is not merely getting full employment, but by what method, according to what principle is this to be secured? Is the town to be the centre of Indian life, or the village? Is there to be centralisation or is there to be decentralisation of industry? Is there to be a State based on violence or non-violence? All these questions will arise when we take up the question of full employment. We shall have to decide as to what methods to adopt and whether, those methods are in tune with the Indian or Western tradition.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, I heartily extend my support to this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Before you proceed further I have to inform you that there are 13 speakers more who have given their names and I want the hon. Minister to reply at 5-30 P.M. Therefore I would request hon. Members to have in mind the restriction of time and not to take more than ten minutes each.

PROF. G. RANGA: That means it is second reading. I hope you are leaving some time for the third reading so that those of us who cannot be squeezed in between may have a chance.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If hon. Members do not take more than ten minutes, all will have a chance.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: May I know whether your number 13 includes my name?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, you have not sent your name.

AN HON. MEMBER: Were we required to give our names?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let us not waste our time. Let us proceed.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: I hope the Chair's eye will catch others also who are not on the list?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will call upon the hon. Minister to reply

at 5-30. Such of you as will catch my eye will have the chance.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, khadi is a subject on which I must speak, with your permission of course. I hope you will include my name in the list.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister represents the party in power, and he can speak for you. Let us proceed.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Before I go to my own remarks, I would like to meet one important point raised by my hon. friend, Shri H. N. Kunzru. While referring to the reservation of sarees and dhotis, he observed that this was a question which was true largely of Madras and which was not largely true of the North and that therefore any relief based on this question is not just. He questioned the justification of this Bill. I must say, Sir, with all due respect to the hon. Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru that he is in all matters thoroughly informed, but in this matter he is short of information. He does not seem to know that the handloom industry is as widely spread in the North as well as in the South. In the South, Sir, there is no State in which the handloom industry does not claim a majority of the population and in the North in all the States that he mentioned you find people engaged in the industry. We have handloom weavers in Madhya Pradesh; we have handloom weavers in U.P., in Saurashtra, in Gujarat, in West Bengal, in Bihar and in Vindhya Pradesh. I do not know of conditions in Punjab, but I very well think there also you have handloom weavers. These handloom weavers are not mostly cotton yarn weavers. Most of them are woollen yarn weavers. They spin wool and they weave most fine fabrics. They produce fine woollen things; I have purchased them myself and I am still preserving them. Although we in the South are far advanced in handloom weaving as a rule,

[Shri Govinda Reddy.] we still And some fine specimens done by the North which are a pride to the whole country.

Apart from this, even supposing that this measure is going to apply largely to the South, even supposing it is true, Sir, are we to say that we have not to look to the regional interests, and if we do look we oppose the interests of the land as a whole? Supposing we say that more than two-thirds of the money invested on irrigation and power projects is spent for the benefit of the North, because most of the projects are situated in the North, would not the South be justified in questioning that? Should not the South equally share the investment that is made? So, Sir, this is not the criterion by which we should judge the merits of the **Bill**. We have to look at it from only one point, that is, whether this Bill is not meeting out justice, whether it is not a good remedy for the difficulty that has arisen among the artisan class of handloom weavers.

Then, Sir, the first point which I would like to impress upon the hon. Members of this House is the enormity of the problem. Weaving, Sir, has been one of the most ancient occupations of man. We have the saying that "when Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?" Before man became a gentleman, he was a weaver and before woman became a gentle-woman, she was a spinner. I say this because it applies truly to India. No other country in the world can claim specialisation in handloom weaving and spinning as India does today. The enormity of the problem hon. Members must realise, because they are not found spread out in a stray manner in villages. People in the North may not have any conception at all of the problem in the South. We have whole villages that consist of handloom weavers, whose sole occupation, whose sole calling, whose sole source of livelihood is handloom weaving.

PROP. G. RANGA: That is the case in Bihar and in U.P. also.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Possible. We have a village of 10,000 population of which 8,000 to 9,000 of the inhabitants are handloom weavers. We have towns of 20 to 40 lakhs of people more than 80 per cent, of whom are weavers. So this is not a problem which is slight. It is a problem which affects not less than 10 million people in the South alone and therefore, Sir, it merits serious consideration of this House.

Then the plight of the handloom industry has been referred to by most of the hon. Members. From the very inception this industry has been having very bad times. If there was one good year for the handloom weaver and spinner, there were ten bad years. This has been so from the middle ages right down to the modern age. We have a phrase "soldier's wife". A soldier's wife's existence is considered to be most precarious. Similarly there is a saying widely current in the South called the "weaver's wife". Weaver's wife means she is the most afflicted and miserable person in the world. This saying is still current in the South and truly represents the miserable picture and the miserable plight of the weaver. I said, Sir, that handloom weaving and handloom spinning is the sole occupation of most of the artisans in the industry in the South. When that is so, it could be easily seen that when there was no bright prospect in any year, the whole family went starving. We had recently satyagraha in Madras. The papers during the years 1951 and 1952 carried reports of many cases of hand-loom weavers hanging themselves and committing suicides on account of starvation. The handloom organisations were compelled to launch satyagraha in order to demand the attention of Government and in order to secure relief, but, Sir, Government did not wholeheartedly come to the aid of these handloom weavers, it must, be admitted. The Government which preceded the people's Government were interested in seeing that the handloom industry was ruined, that the handloom industry in India did

not survive, because it affected Lancashire. But when the people's Government came, because the handloom weavers were not organised, because they were not vocal and vociferous, no attention was paid to them. It is only now that the Government has come forward, during the last year and this year, to say that the hand-loom weavers deserve relief, and the Government has sought seriously and earnestly to give them relief. So, although this measure is a belated measure, nonetheless its advantage to the community is true. There are various ways of giving relief to hand-loom weavers. The relief that this measure is going to give does not go far in solving their problems. There are other problems which have to be solved.

The first difficulty of the handloom weaver was marketing. It must go to the credit of the handloom industry's organisation that it survived and that it succeeded in establishing a market as against mills' competition. Government did not lift their little finger to help the handloom industry in securing a market for its products. The handloom industry by itself, through ingenious methods of finding newer and newer designs, of weaving textiles which are enduring, succeeded in creating a market not only in India but even outside. Shri Rajago-pal Naidu referred to the markets outside. He referred to Ceylon. Burma, Indonesia etc. which are still importing our handloom products. In Ceylon, the entire population wears our lungis and our sarees. So, Sir, they have solved for themselves the marketing problem. And the technical problem also they have solved for themselves; without Government helping them in the matter of scientific research and in the matter of designs, they have been able to help themselves. Not much is required. Government is not required to spend much money either in giving them instruction in newer designs and better designs or in any other research. What they want is facilities. The first is yarn. The first difficulty of the handloom weaver is yarn. Yarn

was not available in adequate quantities. If only yarn is available in adequate quantities, the handloom weaver will face mill competition. He is not afraid of facing mill competition. Price is another factor which hampers him. But in certain varieties like dhotis, sarees, towels, bedsheets. etc., the handloom weaver is very skilful and his designs are more attractive than mill designs, and the little margin in price which the consumer may be called upon to pay, he does not mind paying. So that, if a continuous supply of yarn is assured to the handloom weaver, he will thrive. Government have to take care to see that not only adequate supplies are assured to the handloom industry, but that fair distribution is made of this yarn to all the handloom weavers.

The other point is that, as I said, the weaver is very poor. He is re-sourceless. The co-operative society must go to his aid in providing yarn, in providing advances for the purchase of that yarn, and also in taking his finished product and paying him in advance and in securing a better market for it. If co-operatives can be fully useful anywhere, it is in the handloom industry; it is here that they will confer the greatest benefit on the people. So, co-operative organisations must be strengthened. Government should not hesitate to give financial aid to co-operative societies. On the other hand, they should take the initiative in organising co-operative societies and in financing them, both for giving advances on yarn as well as on manufactured products, as well as for exploring better markets.

The other point which I would like to make is that the Government must now take a further step from the step they have taken in making reservation for the handloom industry. There are certain other varieties of fabrics which mills also produce and which mills should be prevented from producing. There must be a fair distribution of the varieties of fabrics. The mills should not produce those fabrics

[Shri Govinda Reddy.] which the handlooms are producing. The point was raised by Shri Parikh and perhaps by Shri Kunzru also that the handloom industry was not capable of supplying adequately dhotis and sarees and other products. Weil, Sir, they are ignoring how vast the expansion of the handloom industry in the South. Ten villages in the South will be able to produce the goods in a day which a textile mill will be able to produce.

[Shri B. C. Ghose in the Chair.]

Therefore, if yarn is provided and financial assistance is given to them, the handloom weavers will be able to cater to the needs of the whole country and will not fall short of the required production. So, I would like Government to devote more attention to this problem of making reservation in other varieties also. As some hon. Members suggested, it would be desirable to levy this cess on certain other varieties. According to the definition of "cloth" here, the same definition as is contained in the First Schedule of the Central Excises and Salt Act is adopted here. Superfine cloth does not come under the definition as given there. So, we cannot levy this cess on superfine cloth. If only coarse cloth or even medium cloth were exempted from the cess, it would be all right. But why should fine and superfine cloth be exempted from the cess?

PROF. G. RANGA: Are those varieties being exempted now?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: According to this definition, we cannot levy a cess on superfine cloth and on fine cloth.

PROF. G. RANGA: What does the hon. Minister say?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: He will reply to this point, I suppose.

PROF. G. RANGA: The hon. Minister nods.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: They are not included in the definition of

"cloth". Here, we can levy a cess on cloth. And "cloth" in this Bill has the definition given to it in the First Schedule to the Central Excises and Salt Act.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: May I interrupt, Sir? Under the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, "cloth" means any type of cloth manufactured either wholly from cotton or partly from cotton and partly from any other material, but does not include the following:—

- (i) ready-made clothing other than dhotis and sarees;
- (ii) hosiery ;
- (iii) leather cloth and inferior or imitation leather cloth ordinarily used in book-binding;
- (iv) tracing paper, etc.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: Does not the definition exclude superfine and fine cloth?

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: No.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: May I point out to the hon. Minister that superfine cloth is not a part of the definition of "cloth"? So far as the definition of "cloth" is concerned, it ends at clause (vii). Then there is a big clause (1) wherefrom begins the amount of cess that is levied. So far as the definition of "cloth" is concerned, it ends with the first para.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I am grateful to the hon. Member. What I said was that, so far as the definition of "cloth" is concerned, it is only what is mentioned in the clause and in the sub-headings thereafter. Superfine cloth, fine cloth, medium cloth and coarse cloth are separately defined.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: But they are not included in "cloth" at all the same. "Cloth" has been defined according to what is contained in the item in the First Schedule to the Central Excises and Salt Act.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Actually the intention is that all cloth should come under this cess, and if any court of law is going to hold the same view as the hon. Member, we will seek a remedy at that time. At the moment we are advised by our legal advisers that we are on firm ground.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: The duty levied on such cloth is shown in the Act. It definitely comes within that definition.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: In the Act it is all right. But here we adopt that definition and we are levying a cess on cloth as defined in the Act, and there all those varieties are excluded from the definition.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: If superfine cloth, fine cloth, medium cloth and coarse cloth are excluded, what remains?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I was wondering myself. But the Schedule makes it so.

The 12th item in the Schedule is cloth and No. 13 is coffee.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: The hon. Member need not labour on that point.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I agree that I need not labour especially when he says that this point has been considered and fine and superfine cloth will be included. I would have wished that the woollen cloth also was included. But supposing woollen is spun by hand, would it come under the definition of 'cloth'? The same difficulty came up in the question of municipalities exempting khadi from octroi. The municipalities did tax woollen fabrics woven on handlooms and it is still so today. In certain municipalities special exemptions were secured, but in other municipalities no exemption was secured. We are still paying octroi on blankets. I would like to have that included. When the rules are being framed, it would be

much better if the hon. Minister gives his consideration to specify this. I would like that point to be kept in view.

I have sent in my amendment, the purport of which I will repeat here. It is this that khadi as defined here means "any handloom cloth woven from yarn hand-spun in India." So, the benefit that would go to the producers of khadi will be from the stage of yarn to weaving of cloth. Whether it goes to the spinner, is a point which is doubtful. I do not think that spinner is excluded. In khadi the most important point is the spinner. Weaving is a very subsidiary thing. We have to organise this *dhunae* and *kotae*. These are the preparatory stages to spinning of yarn. It is the spinning which gives a larger relief to the unemployed than weaving. Therefore, I would like the hon. Minister to include spinners under the rules.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad) : Mr. Chairman, I give my full support to the object of the Bill, but I beg to submit. Sir, that this object will not be gained by the levy of this cess. Our object is to find employment to the handloom weavers, find full employment for that portion of the population which is fit to work, and for that object we want to encourage handloom industry. This levying of a cess of one pice per yard may give us a revenue of of crores which may be distributed among the handloom workers and khadi workers. But by this the real problem of competition between the handloom industry and the mill industry will not be solved. I think, a much better method would have been to have allocated entirely some sections of cloth like sarees and dhotis to handloom industry. It was pointed out by one hon. Member in this House that the handloom industry was not ready for it. I will submit, Sir, a few figures before you which will convince you that the entire cloth needs of this country can be met by handloom industry.

[Shri Kishen Chand.]

In this connection, I beg to point out that there are three million looms in this country. And supposing that one loom can produce 8 to 10 yards of cloth per day; it means 3,000 yards of cloth per year per loom and with 3 million looms, it means 9,000 million yards of cloth every year. Our total production is only 4,500 million yards from mills and 1,500 million yards from handloom. That means the total production now is only 6,000 million yards and if we use all the handlooms to their fullest extent, we can produce 9,000 million yards from handloom only, i.e. 50 per cent, more than what we are producing. It is true, Sir, that all the handlooms are not being fully employed at the present moment. When these 3 million handlooms are producing only 1,500 million yards per year, that means a loom is producing 500 yards of cloth every year. Well, Sir, that means there has been too much growth of looms which are not finding full employment. So I would suggest to the hon. Minister that instead of levying this cess, it will be far better if he allocates certain lines entirely to the handloom industry and they can easily fulfil it.

Sir, some other facts for your consideration will not be out of place. The total labour bill of this mill industry which is producing 4,500 million yards

SHRI T. T. KRISHN AMACHARI: Not square yards; running yards.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: As the width of cloth varies from 27 inches to 45 inches with an average of 30 inches a running yard may be taken as a square yard. I do not mind using the word 'running' instead of 'square' because it is just the same thing. The total price of the mill cloth is Rs. 300 crores every year. Out of that the total labour bill is Rs. 75 crores; the other portion is Rs. 150 crores for cotton. Rs. 75 crores for stores, depreciation, dyeing charges, and profits of the mill industry. So our problem is that the entire labour charge of the mill industry is going to give us Rs. 75 crores. This is not going to solve our

unemployment problem. In the hand-loom industry in the production of 1,500 million square yards, the total labour charge is only 30 crores of rupees every year. The textile industry, whether of mill or of handloom, is giving 105 crores of rupees in labour wages and out of that 105 crores the mills are also employing labour in their weaving sections and if we transferred all the weaving departments to the handloom industry that labour will become unemployed. Therefore the only solution lies in this, namely, that progressively we go on increasing the spinning section of the mill industry and slowly and gradually transferring the weaving section from the mill industry to the handloom industry. If we follow this method we can benefit our country better than by haphazardly levying a cess and distributing it partly as a dole and partly spending it on organisational work. Secondly, Sir, I have pointed out that the principal portion of this cloth, which is worth 300 crores is obtained from mills. By hand-spinning we waste a good deal of cotton because in hand-spinning we do not get the same length of yarn from one pound of cotton as we can get from a spinning mill. In a mill we can spin up to 30 or 40 counts from a variety of cotton which in hand-spinning will not yield us more than 15 or 20 counts. In that way we are wasting a good deal of our cotton in hand-spinning.

PROF. G. RANGA: It makes you feel warmer because there is more cotton on you.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: But, it is a question of national economy. If cotton is wasted in that way we have got to import cotton. To that extent it is throwing away good money on the purchase of foreign cotton instead of utilising our own cotton to the fullest extent. In my own way I am trying to point out that out of 225 crores worth of cotton if we go on utilising it for hand-spinning with the consequential waste resulting therefrom, we may be wasting nearly 75 crores

worth of cotton. In that view of the matter it is better to have spinning done by the mills and distribute 75 crores as subsidy to the handloom weavers than to really insist upon spinning being done by handloom. You must make better utilisation of the cotton available and not waste it and thus save the 80 crores of rupees which we are now paying in foreign exchange for the purchase of foreign cotton to meet our present requirements. If we save that 80 crores of rupees we will be in a much better position to help our handloom industry and therefore, Sir, in conclusion in supporting this Bill I will submit to the Hon. Minister to reconsider the provisions of this Bill and instead of levying a duty or cess he should earmark the entire dhoti and saree sections to the handloom industry and thereby help the indigenous industry.

SHRI RAMA RAO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I shall attempt, in the course of my speech, to answer the various points raised by Dr. Kunzru. I must say, Sir, that today he brought to his speech a certain sense of passion, which only heightened the effect of the austere intellectual treatment he gives to any subject under discussion.

His first inquiry was: are we hurrying forward with this handloom industry alone while there are other industries which are equally claiming our attention? Our trouble is that we cannot all at once liquidate the evil heritage of centuries of slavery and bondage under foreign rule. We can only proceed slowly.

I must protest against Mr. Govinda Reddy's stealing the little quotation which I had put away in a corner of my notes, a quotation from Bams. The handloom industry is one of the most ancient and my friend quoted the famous lines: "When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentler man?" The Indian National Congress is committed to khaddar and the hand-loom industry's protection. We have been returned largely by the kisan

vote and this Bill is intended to help our constituents. It has been said that there is a political motive behind it. It is a most honourable and honest political motive if it is there and I am prepared to accept the accusation. It has also been pointed out that we might have waited till the Textile Inquiry Committee reported when we would have before us: a comprehensive report. I admit it may be so, but there is not much that the Committee can report. As a matter of fact, it is not going to make an inquiry into the whole situation. It has been only given certain terms of reference, which indicate what the State of India wants. And that State wants a complete integration of the rural economy. To that extent, therefore, we are right in proceeding with a subject with which we are thoroughly familiar. Dr. Kunzru has brought up the case of Madras and levelled the charge that there has been a good deal of "political pressure" from the Madras Government with regard to assistance for the handloom industry. I cannot understand what "political pressure" can have been exerted by the Congress Government of Madras headed by Shri Rajagopalachari. But I do maintain that if in this case pressure has been exercised, it has been exercised in a very humanitarian and in a very just and generous manner. Madras is the largest handloom industry centre in India. I myself come from a village which is a predominantly handloom village and I like this bill. I cannot but appreciate the effort Shri Rajagopalachari is making and the help he is giving the industry. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari has made a good speech and I thank him for the help that he is giving our villages. There is nothing of hurry and haste about this Bill. We are only pursuing the States settled policy, and that policy is crystal clear. We have already taken action to classify the goods to be produced by the handloom and the goods to be produced by the mills. So this House cannot complain that it has been taken by surprise when the next step is being taken. As I have already said political motives are being attributed. Sir,

[Shri Rama Rao.] imputation is no argument. Let me explain the philosophy underlying this measure. First the Congress is committed to khaddar and the handloom. Secondly, we believe in the Gandhian principle of decentralization to the extent, if possible, of finally dissolving the capitalistic structure. We want to create a classless society. This is the process, right, genuine and correct process, and we are right in supporting this measure which is taking us along this road.

It is unfortunate that Dr. Kunzru spoke a language rather heretical for a liberal and that is the language of "South and North", which only shows that his economics have become slightly musty. The fact remains that ever since the Non-co-operation movement started, ever since Mahatma Gandhi made khaddar the symbol of our fight and the charkha the weapon of our emancipation, the economics of the handloom industry have been frequently discussed. Walk into the library, read the writings of Mahatma Gandhi and you will find a hundred things stated in support of the simple and elementary proposition that so far as the handloom industry is concerned, it is universal and is not a question of geographical descriptions—North or South, "what about the U.P. leather industry?". Dr. Kunzru says: "I have the great advantage of enjoying a dual or triple sub-nationality. I am willing to support any measure in this House which wants to support the leather industry of U.P., though I don't love the smell of leather."

"Will this handloom industry ever pay in competition with the mill industry?" was the question raised by Dr. Kunzru, and other economists. I tried to follow the speech of Mr. Parikh, I thought it was full of esoterics rather than of economics. I got confused as to the exact import of what he was saying. I don't say that his excellent speech contained any mental reservations but I did feel that it was something much beyond my

comprehension. I can only say that if it comes to a question of this country having to choose between the mill industry and the handloom industry, it will not have a moment's hesitation about the choice. We will go in for the handloom, the whole of the handloom and nothing but the handloom.

May I next ask how so faithful a Liberal as Dr. Kunzru forgot what Gokhale said years ago. That great patriot, statesman and economist was once asked what he thought of industrial protection for India. He said he would rather wait. He had doubts about it. The grant of protection by a foreign government to a subject race's industry might have calamitous consequences. Gokhale held, because it would be dominated by some sinister motives. You know why they protected our sugar industry. Britain does not produce sugar. Our sugar industry by coming up, threw out Holland's (Indonesian's) production. When however it came to protection of the textile industry, we had to accept the Mody-Lees pact. They saw to it that Imperial Preference operated in this field. In free India we have to set about making plans and programmes as we can. Gokhale was doubtful in his time, but there is no reason for us to be doubtful now and we want this Bill in order that we may proceed further.

It also begins the principle of internal protection *i.e.*, protection of one section of the industry against another, so that the weaker might be made safe against the depredations of the stronger. There is nothing wrong in it. After all when Kunti had to distribute food among her children, she took good care to see that Bhima was well fed. If one of the greatest rural industries of this country requires to be protected in a generous measure, it has got to be done, and it is being done.

I must refer again, to the essentially economic aspect of the question raised by Dr. Kunzru: Will this handloom industry ever pay its way? I would in answer again quote his

guru's i.e. guru Mahadev Govind Ranade. Once he went to Calcutta, wearing very rough cloth. People looked at him and said, "what, you oh Ranade, wearing such rough cloth"? He replied, "Yes, but what can I do? This is all our Bombay mills can produce." That means economics pure and simple do not matter. Only the sentiment of Swadeshi matters and there is nothing wrong in it. The trouble is that men like Dr. Kunzru, in their approach to the economic questions of the modern day, divorce them from the background of sentiment, of feeling, and of that historical tradition which is so much a part of the upbringing of every Congressman in this country.

The question has been asked as to how long we are going to help this industry artificially. I admit that it is wrong to go on indefinitely, but are there not industries in the world, especially in U.S.A., deliberately protected just because the people feel that they are essential to their existence? If, therefore, the rural textile industry of India is necessary for her existence, there is no reason why we should not protect it even by "artificial" methods. If you don't give enough clothing to the poor, they will not understand what freedom is. I recall an incident, we a party of journalists witnessed in company of Pandit Nehru in 1946 after his release from jail. An old woman, in tottered clothes, came to him and said, "Pandit ji I did not understand the Congress and all that before. I did not bother the least if you fellows were sent to jail. Now I understand. For few years I have not had a new sari owing to war conditions. I am with you if you can drive the Britisher out and if you can give me more cloth." Is it not the duty of the Congress to clothe the people in the best manner possible and in the quickest manner possible? It may be that today we have to make sacrifices and call upon our country to undergo privations. But a process of evolution must involve such difficulties.

May I next point out that it is rather difficult for us to put up with any unsentimental approach to the question of khaddar. Let me repeat that economics is not merely a matter of text-books, professors and pandits. It is associated with the psychology of man. Khaddar was the livery of the Indian National Congress when it was fighting the battle of freedom and today it continues to be the livery, even if all the Communists and all other non-Congressmen go on talking the wildest nonsense against the Congress. The khadi cap carries weight even today in spite of the degradation to which it has come because of the misbehaviour of some Congressmen. It is still the symbol of hope. This is one of the reasons why if the Congress wants to resurrect itself, it must go on with khaddar and more khaddar.

Sir, Wordsworth has made the phrase "botanising on his mother's grave". A botanist goes to his mother's grave and instead of filial sentiment expressing itself through his mind, he begins to examine its root, leaf, and flower, it is the science of plants that interests him. It does happen that some minds are differently attuned.

The question has been asked how much employment handloom will give. I would say that even if it feeds only a few, we shall be contented—May I in this connection quote what Rabindranath Tagore said in a letter to Gandhiji years ago? This is from Young India, October 13, 1921:

"The human bird under the Indian sky gets up weaker than when it pretended to retire. For millions it is an eternal trance. It is an indescribably painful state which has got to be experienced to be realised. I have found it impossible to soothe suffering patients with a song from Kabir. The hungry millions ask for one poem—invigorating food. They cannot be given it. They must earn it. And they can earn only by the sweat of their brow."

[Shri Rama Rao.]

Sir, in 1945, I happened to be at Sevagram and listening to a speech by Mahatma Gandhi, probably one of the finest speeches he ever made. It was a great occasion too, being the foregathering of the Congress clan—I think a meeting of the Charkha Sangh. Some of the people present began to get excited, to lose their consciousness, to wonder at the philosophy Mahatmaji was preaching. Speaking about khaddar, he did not discuss its economics, or khadi versus the mill industry. He put it on the highest possible platform. He said, "This khaddar I am using to fight my battle against exploitative economy." Take modern industrialism. The small insect is lived upon by the big insect, the bigger insect. lives upon the big insect and *ad infinitum*. All this must stop, if civilisation is to progress not on the present orthodox lines, but on a new pattern altogether.

I am therefore proud to offer my enthusiastic support to this Bill not only as a Member of this Parliament, but as one who comes from a village which, let me repeat, is one whose famous handloom products go to the farthest ends of the earth.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: (Madras) : Mr. Vice-Chairman. I rise to

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: On a point of information, Sir. Is it "Vice-Chairman" or "Chairman"?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: You go on, please.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: I rise to make some observations on the Bill introduced by the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry. I have the privilege of speaking after a powerful speech made by the hon. Member who claims to come from the same part of the country as I come from and I have to tell him at the very first instance that though he has supported this Bill under the impression that it is going to improve the lot of the hand-

loom industry, to give protection to the weaver and also rehabilitate him properly, he,—Mr. Rama Rao—is out of touch with his own village and he does not know the starvation there or the persons living in that village or the persons who died out of starvation, all because of the policy followed by the Congress Government, the Congress Government which has given the handloom weaver during its five years' rule his extinction. That is the plight of the handloom weaver today.. And, now after so many years this Bill has come before us for discussion..

Before I come to examine the provisions of this Bill I must refer to the portion of the speech of the hon. Minister when introducing the Bill where he said that the Bill was intended to raise funds for the purpose of developing the cottage industries. Therefore, before we give our consent to this Bill, it is better if we know the position of cottage industries in our country. I do not mean to take up much time and will not go into details. The plight of the cottage industries— especially that of the handloom weaver —has been wonderfully well described by my hon. friend Shri Govinda Reddy. Take his position. Out of the 28 lakhs of handlooms in India— I may give a margin and say that it is an inflated figure and it may be only 20 lakhs—even putting it at 20 lakh looms, even then a third of this number is in Madras State and nearly 12 lakh persons are dependent on this industry. If you examine this industry properly, you will find that the number of workers engaged in this particular trade is between 50 to 60 lakhs. In the mill industry there are 8 lakhs employed. The production of cloth in 1950-51 was 75 crore yards and that of mill industry 371 crore yards. The total capital invested in the handloom industry is Rs. 12 crores and that in the mill industry is Rs. 127 crores. The capital invested per worker in the handloom industry is only Rs. 20 whereas in the mill industry it is 130 times this sum *i.e.* Rs. 2,540. If you examine the position further, you will find that

the cost of production varies from 10 to 80 per cent, for handloom industry—that is cost of the yarn and labour costs from 12 to 23 per cent. The main problem of this cottage industry is the adequate wage of the worker and the proper supply of his raw material, that is to say, the yarn that he requires for producing the cloth.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: My hon. friend forgets that without the mills the handloom weavers cannot get their yarn.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: I am coming to that. I understand it and shall take it up. You supply the yarn to the handloom weavers. That means that I am conceding that there must be a mill for spinning yarn. If you examine the figures for South India you will find that you have got a number of spinning mills—most of the mills in Madras State are spinning mills—and even then the yarn spun in the mills in South India is not given to the handloom weaver in the South because of the policy of the Government of India all these years. I do not know the present position. They have got, what they call the yarn pool. In the pool they take the yarn and give 50 per cent, for distribution to the handloom weavers through many intermediaries and as far as I know the position of the handloom weaver in Madras State is such that he cannot get sufficient yarn for his own looms. He is devoid of his raw material. And even if he gets it, he gets it at a rate at which he cannot buy and by producing cloth with that he cannot compete with the mill-made cloth, cloth made by mechanical processes. So the problem of the handloom weaver is the problem of protecting the weaker sector. That is protection for the 50 lakhs of handloom weavers and this can be given if we plan our economy in such a way that we see that each sector gets its due share and we help the consumer by supplying the cloth adequately at reasonable prices. Now, many suggestions have been made for giving protection to this industry. The Madras

Legislative Assembly passed a Resolution demanding the reservation of certain varieties of cloth *dhoties* and sarees—for the handlooms. There is another suggestion, and that is to subsidise the industry and by that way

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. Member likely to take much longer?

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: I will require some more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned to 4 P.M.

The Council then adjourned till four of the clock in the afternoon.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at four of the clock in the afternoon, MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAM: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was referring about the reservation of dhoties and on examining this thing we find that the base year April 1951-March 1952 taken for purposes of this, the average monthly production of dhoties by mills during this year is as high as 50,352 bales and on this basis the mills are now exempted to reduce their monthly production to about 30,210 bales but actually even before the order for restriction of production became effective the mills, faced with accumulation of stocks, had reduced themselves the output and on an average it was 37,261 bales during the months April-December, 1952 and from this we will find the figures at 36,412 bales in November and 45,933 bales in December as compared with 34,126 bales in September, 35,570 bales in August and so on. Thus, it may not be out of place to state that the purpose behind the order of Government was more in keeping with the interests of the millowners to fix the base year and therefore, did not in any way help the handloom industry. To argue from this that there should be reservation of sarees and dhoties for the

[Shri K. L. Narasimham.] handloom industry does not really solve the problem of the handloom industry. Now, the problem of the handloom industry is the supply of adequate yarn at a cheaper rate and that too by subsidising the supply of yarn. We find Government now giving more relief to the millowners and they have given relief in the form of reduction in export duty from 25 per cent, to 10 per cent, and if we examine the figures we will find a strange phenomenon. Before the war, 1938-39, India produced 5,000 million yards, 3,900 million yards of mill cloth and 1,700 million yards of handloom cloth and our exports were only 137 million yards but in 1950-51 we find that the cloth exported is about 1,283 million yards and the handloom production has gone down to 810 million yards. This shows that the handloom weaver is without work, mills are producing more and that production is going out of the country and the people at large in the country are not able to buy even this meagre quota of cloth of 9 yards that is supplied to them. We see the Government giving more relief to the millowners rather than to the weaver himself and from this you will find stocks accumulating in the co-operative stores and handloom weavers' organisations about to be closed. Sometimes we hear stories about the handloom weaver asking for doles; in fact the Government of Madras has given them atleast in certain areas Rs. 25 so that they can go to the co-operative society to become Members to enable them to market their produce. Even those societies are not functioning properly and just now while I was reading the papers I came across a report that has appeared in a Telugu Daily 'Vishal Andhra' of the 11th of this month. This paper reports that one by name V. Satyanarayana, 19 years of age in a Village Vemnadu, Bhimavaram Taluk, West Godavari District, had committed suicide on 7th April 1953 as he could not maintain himself and his family and before his death he addressed a letter to Shri Rajagopala-chari, Chief Minister of Madras Statp

and that letter is published in this paper, *Vishal Andhra*, I do not want to take much time of the House by re-reading the entire letter. I will give you extracts. He says in that letter "I am a witness to scenes of the hand-loom weavers who could not maintain themselves and who could not console their children when they ask for food". This is Mandapeta, in East Godavari District which is mainly a handloom centre—"also when your son asks for food, how do you feel? In my case when I could not maintain my family and I could not get even medical help necessary in the Government hospitals. I am forced to take the step and I am committing suicide" and he appealed in this letter "You Rajaji" This is in Telugu and I do not want to read this passage. He says: "....." (reads portions in Telugu)" "The day will come when you have to realise the peoples' voice and you would have realised to a certain extent in the recent elections and now, under your power madness you forget the people." Here is the letter and this reveals a heart-rending story of a youth of 19 years, a handloom worker who could not maintain his family and who was forced to commit suicide. This industry has got 1,500 handlooms in Tammala-maduga Cuddappah District and those people approached the District Collector to open gruel centres which were previously running and were subsequently closed. These Centres were distributing doles to the handloom weavers and even that was stopped recently and 1,500 people approached the District Collector asking him to open gruel centres. This is the deplorable condition in these parts and in these conditions you bring in a Bill asking for our sanction, our permission to levy a cess on mill made cloth and in that way collect Rs. 5 crores in the name of the development of the handloom industry and khadi. I have to submit that the Government is tinkering with the problem and this Bill is not going to help the hand-loom industry in the real sense and, as I have already stated, the hand-

loom industry should be protected. It could be protected only by one way and that is by subsidising it and supplying yarn to the handloom weaver, yarn which forms 3/4ths of the coat, at the cost price or even at less than the cost price—at the mill rate, straight from the mill to the handloom weaver if not to the co-operative society, eliminating the intermediary agencies. Supply them with adequate yarn and then fix a minimum wage, minimum living wage to the handloom weaver and ask him to join the co-operative societies and allow him to produce handloom cloth after giving all facilities for marketing that commodity. The products could be purchased for Government purposes. Then only you can rehabilitate the lakhs of handloom workers who are starving. Unless you do that, unless you subsidise them in that way, you cannot solve the problem. The Bill that is before us is not solving the problem in the real sense; it is tinkering with the lives of the handloom weavers and is in no way going to give adequate and necessary relief to the handloom weavers.

Coming to the relief that is offered through the Bill, I will only say this.

(Time bell rings.)

The Government, as the hon. Minister said, is going to collect Rs. 5 crores of rupees and this will be used for giving them help in the form of enabling them to join co-operative societies, standardisation in marketing the goods and in trying to make propaganda for their goods. He is not saying that he will give relief in any form but I will suggest, even within this Rs. 5 crores, that he can do certain things that is, start relief centres on co-operative basis, introduce utility cloth manufacture, etc. and this can be done by adopting the suggestions which I have already mentioned. This Rs. 5 crores should not be used for paying salaries for persons collecting this cess and this should in no way be accounted under this head. This amount

should be utilised for rehabilitating the handloom weaver and that too, a large part should go to the Madras State which has got 1/3rd of the total handloom weavers of India and who are in a miserable condition. I hope Government will take note of the serious condition of the handloom weavers in Madras and supply them with adequate yarn, not on the basis of an all-India pool. I am trying to visualise a situation if Andhra State is to be formed on 1st October. We do not have spinning mills. Only two spinning mills are there. We have got one at Guntur District and another at Adoni, but there is not enough yarn to supply to them. It is therefore the duty of the Central Government to see that adequate yarn is supplied and the handloom weavers are helped in the proper sense.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: May I ask whether the hon. Member supports the Bill or opposes it?

SHRI K. L. NARAYAN SIMHAN: I think you have not followed me from the beginning.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members will please confine themselves to ten minutes.

(Shri K. B. Lai whose name was called out was not present in the House.)

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: If absentee Members are not given the chance it would be better.

SHRIMATI CHANDRAVATI LAKHANPAL (Uttar Pradesh):

श्रीमती चन्द्रवती लखनपाल (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीमन्, सदन के अधिकांश वक्ताओं ने अभी तक आपके सम्मुख करघा उद्योग की दुर्दशा का चित्र रखा है और खादी की अपेक्षा उसी उद्योग को सरकारी सहायता और सरकारी सहानुभूति का पात्र सिद्ध करने का प्रयत्न किया है। मुझे हैंडलूम इंडस्ट्री से कोई विरोध नहीं है किन्तु इस समय में आपके

[Shrimati Chandravati Lakhanpal.]

सम्मुख कुछ थोड़े से शब्दों में खादी की दुर्दशा का वर्णन करूँगी जिसकी दुर्दशा मैं समझती हूँ कि करण के व्यवसाय की दुर्दशा से किसी भी हालत में कम नहीं है। इसके अतिरिक्त खादी के ऐतिहासिक महत्व की तरफ तथा अपने देश की औद्योगिक तथा आर्थिक व्यवस्था में खादी का जो स्थान है, उन विषयों के ऊपर आपका ध्यान आकर्षित किया चाहती हूँ।

स्वतन्त्रता मिलने के पश्चात् इन पाँच सालों के अन्दर जो इस समय खादी की अवस्था है वह अत्यन्त ही शोचनीय और करुणाजनक है। आम जनता समझती है कि अब खादी के पहिनने का कोई महत्व नहीं; स्वतन्त्रता मिलने के बाद खादी की कोई उपयोगिता नहीं। आम जनता की बात को छोड़ दीजिये, कांग्रेस-जनों को ही देखा जायें तो यह कहना पड़ेगा कि आज खादी के अन्दर से कांग्रेस के सदस्यों का विश्वास और श्रद्धा धीरे धीरे खत्म सी होती चली जा रही है। कांग्रेस के सम्बन्ध में महात्मा गांधी का विचार था कि कांग्रेस और खादी इन दोनों चीजों का बड़ा अटूट सम्बन्ध है। उनका कथन था और उनका विचार था कि खादी ही कांग्रेस को जीवित रख सकती है और इसी-लिये उन्होंने कांग्रेस के कर्मठ सदस्यों के लिए खादी का पहिनना और खादी का व्यवहार एक अनिवार्य शर्त रखी थी। आज देश के अन्दर कर्मठ सदस्यों की संख्या तो करोड़ों में बढ़ती चली जा रही है किन्तु आश्चर्य की बात तो यह है कि खादी की खपत दिनों दिन घटती जा रही है श्रीमन्, यह अवस्था खादी उद्योग के लिए ही नहीं वरन् कांग्रेसजनों के लिए भी लज्जाजनक है। इसके अतिरिक्त अपनी ही कांग्रेसी सरकार होने के नाते यह कहना ही पड़ेगा कि खादी के प्रति कांग्रेसी सरकार की जो जिम्मेदारी थी, खादी के प्रति कांग्रेस का

जो कर्तव्य था, उसके प्रति वह अत्यन्त उदासीन और बेसुध रही है। श्रीयुत माननीय कुंजरू के विचारों के प्रति पूर्ण सम्मान रखते हुए भी मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि आज जो यह बिल सदन के अन्दर लाया जा रहा है वह अब से बहुत पहले सदन के सम्मुख उपस्थित किया जाना चाहिए था। फिर भी यह आशा की जा सकती है कि मृत प्रायः तथा सिसकता हुआ जो खादी का उद्योग है उसके अन्दर यह विधेयक कुछ थोड़ा सा जीवन अवश्य फूकेगा और उसके लिए संजीविनी का कार्य करेगा।

श्रीमन्, करोड़ों भारतीयों के लिए खादी एक बहुत ऊँची कल्पना रही है। खादी को पहिन कर ही इस देश के करोड़ों व्यक्तियों ने, अमीरों ने और गरीबों ने, हिन्दुओं ने और मुसलमानों ने, स्वतन्त्रता की लड़ाई लड़ी है। खादी की ही छत्रछाया में हमने समानता और एकता का पाठ पढ़ा है। खादी के साथ न केवल देशभक्ति और देशप्रेम की ही भावना है वरन् देशसेवा, साधना, आत्मत्याग और समस्त ऊँची और पवित्र कल्पनायें खादी के साथ जुड़ी हुई हैं। खादी ही महात्मा गांधी का एकमात्र सजीव और सच्चा स्मारक है। यदि खादी खत्म हुई तो यह समझिये कि महात्मा गांधी का नाम भी इस देश की आम जनता, करोड़ों गरीब ग्राम में बसने वाले भारतीयों के हृदय से खत्म हुआ। कहा जा सकता है कि महात्मा गांधी के नाम को सत्य और अहिंसा का सिद्धांत अमर बनाये रखेगा किन्तु आज देश की जो साधारण जनता है जो साधारण व्यक्ति है वह रोटी और कपड़े की समस्या में इतना अधिक उलझा हुआ है कि वह सत्य और अहिंसा के ऊँचे ऊँचे सिद्धान्तों की चर्चा करेगा और उनमें दिलचस्पी बनाये रखेगा यह समझना कुछ असंगत और असंभव सा ही लगता है। श्रीमन्, खादी के द्वारा

महात्मा गांधी ने जो जीवन की बुनियादी को पूरा करने के साधनों का सुन्दर समन्वय किया है वह कोई साधारण बात नहीं। काश, कि हम उस शब्द का महत्व समझ सकते। खादी के रेशे रेशे में, खादी के एक एक तार में बापू का, उस महामानव का, कर्ण हृदय व्याप्त है। इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि खादी ही बापू का सच्चा और सजीव स्मारक है।

श्रीमन्, खादी एक कपड़ा नहीं किन्तु एक भावना है। मानव को सर्वांगीण सुन्दर और सब प्रकार से सामर्थ्यशाली बनाने की एक ऊँची कल्पना है। खादी शोषण नहीं सर्वोदय चाहती है। बापू कहा करते थे कि खादी का पहनने वाला न नंगा रहेगा और न भूखा रहेगा। यही कल्पना, यही सर्वोदय की कल्पना, खादी का आधारभूत सिद्धांत है। हमें खादी को इसी सिद्धांत पर जीवित रखना है और इसी सिद्धांत पर यदि खादी को हम रख सके तो निश्चय ही जिस प्रकार खादी के द्वारा हमने राजनैतिक क्रान्ति अपने देश के अन्दर उत्पन्न की और उसमें सफल हुए ठीक उसी प्रकार, यदि खादी को हम महात्मा गांधी के बताये हुए सिद्धांत पर जीवित रख सके, तो इसके द्वारा हम निकट भविष्य में ही उस सामाजिक क्रान्ति के दर्शन कर सकेंगे जो आज हमारे देश के माननीय नेताओं और हमारी सरकार का स्वप्न है।

(Time bell rings)

श्रीमन्, मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूंगी कि दो चार मिनट और देने की कृपा करें। थोड़े से विचार आपके सामने रखने हैं और मैं उन्हें बहुत संक्षेप में कहूंगी। यह कहा जा सकता है कि यह सब भावुकता की बातें हैं लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि यदि व्यावहारिकता की कसौटी पर भी खादी को परखा जाय तो ये पूरी उतरेगी। हर एक आर्थिक विशेषज्ञ इस बात को मानता है कि खादी एक

महत्वपूर्ण गृह-उद्योग है। यह एक उद्योग ही नहीं है बल्कि इसके साथ अनेकों उद्योग जुड़े हुए हैं। कपास से खादी तैयार करने में जो एक एक प्रक्रियाएँ हैं वे स्वयं एक एक उद्योग का स्थान ले सकती हैं। कपास का ओटना, कताई, बुनाई, रंगाई, छाई आदि प्रक्रियाएँ अपने आप स्वतन्त्र रूप से एक एक इंडस्ट्री हैं। यह उद्योग देश के अन्दर लाखों और करोड़ों को काम दे सकता है। यदि कताई को, इसपिनिंग को, अच्छे प्रकार से सुसंगठित और सुव्यवस्थित किया जाय तो विशेषज्ञों का ऐसा अन्दाजा है कि केवल कताई ही देश के ७५ लाख लोगों को काम दे सकती है।

इसके अतिरिक्त यह कहा जा सकता है और यह कहा जाता है कि खादी को सहायता नहीं मिलनी चाहिए क्योंकि वह अपने पैरों पर खड़ी नहीं हो सकती। किन्तु, श्रीमन्, मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि हमें यह कभी भी नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि बेकारी अपने देश की समस्याओं में से एक ऐसी भोषण समस्या है, एक ऐसे सिरदर्द की समस्या है, जिसका हल यदि हमने न सोचा तो वह समस्या एक ऐसी चट्टान बन जायेगी जिससे टकराकर हमारे वेलफेयर स्टेट की जितनी कल्पनाएँ और स्वप्न हैं वे चकनाचूर हो जायेंगे। इसलिए खादी को सहायता देना कोई उस पर अहसान की बात नहीं है। हमें खादी की समस्या को हल करना है और इसलिए कि हमें वेलफेयर स्टेट के स्वप्न को पूरा करना है। खादी अपने देश के अन्दर जो करोड़ों बेकार हैं, जो निराश्रित हैं, जो अनपढ़ हैं और जो लाखों की तादाद में विधवाएँ और स्त्रियाँ हैं उनको सम्मानपूर्वक जीवन व्यतीत करने का एक ऐसा साधन प्रदान करता है जिससे वे अपनी जीविका उपार्जित कर सकते हैं।

अतः मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहती हूँ कि आज का जो बिल है वह वास्तव में स्वागत

[Shrimati Chandravati Lakhanpal.]
करने के योग्य हैं। परन्तु केवल विल से ही काम नहीं चलेगा या दो, एक करोड़ रुपये की सहायता से काम नहीं चलेगा। हमें आम जनता में अपनी सारी योजनाओं को पूरा करने के लिए खादी के प्रति विश्वास और श्रद्धा के भावों को पैदा करना पड़ेगा और ऐसा वातावरण पैदा करना होगा जिससे खादी को फिर से प्रतिष्ठा मिल सके। इसके लिए सबसे प्रभावकारी, इफेक्टिव, उपाय यह है कि जितने भी सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं, माननीय नेतागण और मिनिस्टर्स हैं और बड़े बड़े अफसर हैं सबके लिए राष्ट्रीय परिधान के रूप में खादी का प्रयोग करना आवश्यक कर दिया जाय।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is up, Madam.

बारह मिनट हो गये।

SHRIMATI CHANDRA VATI LAKHANPAL:—

श्रीमती चन्द्रवती लखनपाल : श्रीमान्,
इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करती हूँ।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 102.]

SHRI B. C. GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, we are not opposed to the measure that has been brought forward in this House. What we should like Government to do is to throw some more light on their intentions in the matter of protecting the khadi and handloom industry. Recent measures adopted in this connection, viewed against the background of the story that was related by Dr. Kunzru this morning, would appear to indicate that Government have been impelled if not stampeded to take certain ad hoc measures without deciding their final policy in this matter. What we should like to know is whether this is a makeshift measure or whether Government have a settled and defined policy as to how this industry may be protected.

The difficulties of the handloom and khadi industry are well known. Although a Board has been appointed which is still inquiring into the matter, I am not quite sure that any new light would be thrown on either the difficulties experienced by this industry or the solution that is needed, although they would probably be bringing out some more additional facts which would be quite helpful, I am prepared to admit.

The real problem, as I see it, is this, in its economic aspect. Assuming that khadi and handloom industry cannot stand in competition with mill-made cloth, are Government prepared to give it adequate protection? I want an answer to that. And if Government are prepared to do that, then the next question follows, as to what measures can best achieve that objective. This matter was also considered by the Planning Commission, which, of course, considered all problems that we might have to deal with, and which was quite satisfactory in so far as an examination of our problems and difficulties was concerned, but which was in most cases or in many cases rather vague as to the solution suggested. In the case of the cottage and handloom industries the Planning Commission state that, "a programme of village industries has to be supported both by specific measures of assistance as well as appropriate State policy. In addition to emphasis on technical improvements, research and other measures for improving efficiency, the primary objective of policy should be to provide a field within which each cottage industry may be able to organise itself". The implication of that, to my mind, appears to be that the Planning Commission envisaged that an area should be demarcated for each of the cottage industries; and in detailing the measures that may be necessary, the Planning Commission put this measure first. It said that reservation of spheres of production should come first. The object of this Bill is also envisaged in the measures recommended by the Planning Commission, because the third recommendation is the

imposition of a cess on a large-scale industry. I believe that it is in pursuance of that recommendation of the Planning Commission that this Bill has been brought forward with a view to imposing a cess on a large-scale industry to help a cottage industry.

But what I want to submit to you is this, that unless Government comes to a final decision on this matter they will be only creating difficulties not only for the handloom industry but also for the mill industry. I may illustrate this point. One measure that the Government have adopted is the restriction of production of dhotis and sarees by mills. Now, what has happened? The incidence of that measure is unequal in so far as different mills are concerned. Let us take two extreme cases. A mill producing no dhotis or sarees is not affected at all; and a mill producing only dhotis and sarees is affected to the extent of 60 per cent, of its production. That is a very unfair situation. As the hon. Minister himself must be knowing, there have been protests raised against that measure from certain States, particularly from the State from which I come, and Government has had also to make a certain relaxation in that regard. But that is not a health> situation, because the mill industry IKJ^O not know what is the future for them. Is this 60 per cent, restriction an *ad hoc* temporary measure, or is it indicative of Government's policy in this way, that Government want that all dhotis and sarees should be gradually produced by the handloom and khadi industry? Government should from now on make that point clear, because on that will also depend the Question of the reorganisation of some of the textile mills, because if they are not to produce sarees and dhotis, then a readjustment in many mills would be necessary, and adequate facilities should also be made available to them so that a readjustment can be effected. It cannot be the Government's policy, with a view to mitigating, as the hon. Minister said this morning, unemployment in one sphere, to create unemployment in another sphere. It

must be a policy which has taken all points into consideration and decided as to what the Government should do.

As I stated, the difficulties are well known. If you take the handloom industry, it is a question of yarn, marketing and credit. Assistance may be given and, I believe, will be given in these matters. But so long as areas are not clearly demarcated, I do not believe that this measure will help them in the long run. And I have a lurking suspicion in my mind so long as Government does not make a definite announcement of policy, and it is this, that they are being forced to take certain measures because there is hue and cry in the country, and what they are doing is merely to cushion the gradual extinction of the handloom and cottage industries. Difficulties come; they take *ad hoc* measures; then the agitation to a certain extent is eased. And then people forget about it. Then some weavers go out of employment. Gradually in this way the handloom weaving may die out and probably the Government is only assisting that process. Now we ourselves, that is, our Party are very much against that. We want the handloom and the cottage industries and the khadi industry to thrive; we want them to thrive on economic grounds, on political grounds, on social grounds; on economic grounds because this is a country where there is more labour than capital; on social and political grounds, because we do not like concentration of economic power which leads to concentration of political power. Now, Sir, I know ten minutes are over. I will take only two or three minutes more as I had to say lot of things, but I do not want to take more time on khadi or, which I want to say only a few words.

Now the position of khadi is certainly more difficult than that of the handloom industry from the economic point of view. A lot has been said about sentimental grounds. T ^avp no objection to that. If on sentimental grounds w« could keep

[Shri B. C. Ghose:] khadi alive, nobody would nature of purchases of Government have objected to that, but the fact is that khadi is requirements only in khadi. Unless something in a very difficult position today. The hen. of that nature is done, I do not thing that Minister in the other Hou?e referred to the Harris khadi will have a future.

Tweeds in England which is a home-spun material and he said there is no reason why khadi, Now, the very interesting part of this whole a home-spun material, should not occupy a matter is this, that there is no opposition, so similar position in this country, but the fact is that far as this House or the people outside are during the last few years khadi has been gra- concerned, to the objectives of this Bill. Even dually losing its place. It is in diftv culty today, if you take my Communist friends, they want (*Interruption.*) Let us face the facts. I do not say protection for the hand-loom industry. There that we should not help it, but it has lost its place was no Bill on which there was so much in the Indian economy for obvious reasons consensus of opinion. Therefore, there is no because it is neither convenient—as it is, it is not reason why the Government should not go a very fashionable material. It is neither ahead, if they have any policy, with their economical. Really speaking, the coi> sumers, if policy for the protection of the handloom and you give them free choice, would not probably the khadi industry The unfortunate part of it prefer khadi. It has its value as a Party uniform, is, as far as I can see, that the Government has but unfortunately the Congress Party itself has not a policy. That lacuna has to be removed.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH (Bihar):

..... (*Interruption.*) There has been a relaxation.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh) : Look at me; look at Mr. Kapoor.

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I am perfectly aware as to what I am saying and the hon. Minister will himself bear me out also. We have to consider this proposition whether we want it in relation to domestic economy or a market economy. If it is merely to provide employment to people who are under-employed, then that is another proposition. But if we want that the khadi industry should produce materials which should be marketed, then the position becomes very much more difficult and the Government will have to think about measures which may enable this industry to thrive. They may be in the form, of giving subsidies; they may be in the nature of demarcating areas for this industry; they may be in the

خواجہ عنایت اللہ (بہار) : جذباب

تپتی چھرمین صاحب : میں اس بل کو لانے کے لئے حکومت کو مبارکباد دیتا ہوں - اگرچہ یہ بالکل صحیح ہے کہ جلدی جلدی اور جلدی تھوڑی سے اس کام کو ہمیں کرنا چاہئے تھا اتنی جلدی اور اتنی تھوڑی سے یہ بل اس کام کو نہ کر پائیگا - آج اس بل نے متعلق بہت سی باتیں کہی جا چکی ہیں - میں ایلے تھوڑے سے وقت میں ان باتوں کو دھرنا نہیں چاہتا مگر میں حکومت کو کچھ خاص باتوں کا دھیان دلانا چاہتا ہوں -

ہندوستان میں چار قسم کا کپڑا ملتا ہے - ایک تو فارن کلتریز (foreign countries) غیر ممالک کا کپڑا - دوسرا وہ کپڑا جس کا مل

میں سوت بناتا ہے اور وہیں کپڑا بناتا ہے - تیسرا وہ جس کا سوت تو مل میں بناتا ہے لیکن اس سے کپڑا ہینڈلوم میں تیار ہوتا ہے - اور چوتھا وہ کپڑا جس کا سوت چرخے میں کٹا جاتا ہے اور کرگئے میں کپڑا بنایا جاتا ہے - فارن کلائے کو چھوڑ کر ہمارے دیس میں تین طرح کا کپڑا بنانا ہے - مل کلائے یا مل کے سوت سے ہینڈلوم کا بننا ہوا کپڑا تیسرا کھادی کلائے - اس بل میں انہی تین قسموں کے کپڑوں کی تعریف کی گئی ہے - ایک کو تو مل کلائے کہا گیا ہے دوسرے کو ہینڈلوم کلائے کہا گیا ہے اور تیسرے کو کھادی کلائے کہا گیا ہے - مل کلائے پر کچھ ٹیکس لگا کر ہینڈلوم اور کھادی کلائے کو ترقی دینے کے لئے ایک راستہ نکالا گیا ہے - مگر جو تعریف کی گئی ہے اس سے میری سمجھ میں یہ نہیں آتا کہ ہینڈلوم کلائے اور کھادی کلائے میں کوئی فرق نہیں ہے - انٹرپل منسٹر اور مسٹر صاحبان یہ بات اچھی طرح سے جانتے ہونگے کہ ہینڈلوم ایک قسم کی کھادی ہے جس سے جو سوت ہم کو مل سے ملتا ہے ہم اس سے کپڑا بناتے ہیں - ایک قسم کی اور بھی کھادی ہے جو ہندوستان میں پرنے وقتوں سے چلی آ رہی ہے جس کو زیادہ تعداد میں آج بھی ہندوستان کے غریب گھروں میں چولہے کپڑا بنانے میں کام میں لاتے ہیں - اس کھادی کو بنانے میں

بہت زیادہ خرچ اور پیسے کی ضرورت نہیں ہوتی - عام طور سے لوگ اس کو اپنے گھر ہی میں دو تین لکڑیوں کی مدد سے تانا بانا بنا کر تیار کر لیتے ہیں - ہینڈلوم کے بنانے میں تو کم از کم تین چار سو روپیہ لگ جاتا ہے لیکن اس کھادی کے بنانے میں کچھ بھی خاص خرچ نہیں ہوتا - کسان اور مزدور خود ہی اسے دو تین چھوٹی چھوٹی لکڑیاں گاڑ کر بنا لیتے ہیں اور کام شروع کر دیتے ہیں - یہ بل جو ہم آج یہاں پاس کرنے جا رہے ہیں اس کا مطلب یہ ہے کہ ہم کھادی کو مدد دیں - مگر جو بل میں تعریف دی گئی ہے اس سے یہ معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ ہم صرف ہینڈلوم کی ہی مدد کرنے جا رہے ہیں - اس بل میں ہینڈلوم کی جو تعریف کی گئی ہے وہ اس طرح ہے -

“Handloom cloth means any cloth woven from any material including silk, artificial silk etc.....”

تو میں منسٹر صاحب کا دھیان اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس میں جو لفظ “any material” ہے اس میں کھادی و چرخے کا کٹا ہوا سوت بھی آ جاتا ہے - اگر ہمارے چرخے کا کٹا ہوا سوت ہینڈلوم والے استعمال کرنا شروع کر دیں گے تو ہمارے غریب بھائی جو اپنی کھادی میں کپڑا تیار کرتے ہیں تو ان کو کپڑا بنانے کے لئے سوت کس طرح سے مل سکے گا - اور اگر

[Khawaja Inait Ullah.]

انہیں کھڑا بنانے کے لئے سوت نہیں ملے گا تو اس کا یہ مطلب ہوا کہ ہم کھادی نہیں تیار کر پائیں گے کیونکہ اصلی کھادی صرف کھڈیوں ہی میں تیار ہو سکتا ہے۔ یہ بالکل صحیح ہے اور اس سے کوئی انکار نہیں کر سکتا کہ مہاتما گاندھی جس کپڑے کو کھادی کہتے تھے یا جس دو ہماری زبان میں شدہ کھادی کہا جاتا ہے اسے ہینڈلوم پر نہیں بنایا جا سکتا۔ کیونکہ اس کا بنانا کام میں آ سکتا ہے لیکن تانا کام میں نہیں آ سکتا۔ تو اس طرح سے ہم کھادی کے کپڑے کو بیکار بنا دیں گے اور کھڈی دو بھی بیکار کر دیں گے کیونکہ ہینڈلوم کے آنے ان غریبوں کو جو کھڈیوں پر کپڑا تیار کرتے ہیں سوت نہیں مل سکیگا۔ اس کے ساتھ ہی ساتھ ہم لوگ جو کہ کھادی پہننے والے ہیں ان کو شدہ کھادی کبھی نہیں ملے گی۔ ان کو جو بوی کھادی ملے گی اس میں آدھا سوت تو چرخے کا ہوگا اور آدھا سوت مل کا بنا ہوا ہوگا۔ اس طرح سے کھادی کا کپڑا تیار کیا جائے گا اور ہم سے کہا جائے گا کہ لو شدہ کھادی ہم نے تیار کر دی ہے۔ اس طرح سے ہم کو جو شدہ کھادی ملنی چاہئے تھی وہ میسر نہیں ہوگی۔ کھادی کے پہننے والے سب لوگ جانتے ہیں کہ آج کھادی کے مقابلہ میں

ہینڈلوم کو وہی جگہ دی جاتی ہے جو مل کے کپڑے کو دی جاتی ہے۔ ہینڈلوم کے کپڑے میں مل کا سوت ملا ہوا ہوتا ہے اور کھڈی میں مل کا سوت نہیں ہوتا بلکہ وہ ہاتھ کا کتا ہوا سوت ہوتا ہے۔ اس چیز کا سرکار نے دھیان نہیں دیا ہے۔ اس کا نتیجہ یہ ہو رہا ہے کہ جس طرح سے آج ہم دودھ کھی پانی اور دوسری چیزوں میں اڈلٹریشن (adulteration) دیکھ رہے ہیں اسی طرح ہینڈلوم اور کھادی میں بھی اڈلٹریشن چل رہا ہے۔

AN HON. MEMBER:

ایک انمبرل ممبر: پانی میں اڈلٹریشن کیسے ہوتا ہے؟

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH:

خواجہ عنایت اللہ: شہر میں جا کر دیہاتی لڑک یہ کہتے ہیں کہ یہاں کے پانی میں کچھ ملا ہوا ہے۔

اس لئے میں حکومت کا دھیان اس طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں کہ ہینڈلوم اور کھادی میں جو اڈلٹریشن چل رہا ہے اس کو روکا جانا چاہئے۔ اگر سرکار صحیح معلوم میں کھادی کی خدمت کرنا چاہتی ہے تو اسے کھادی اور ہینڈلوم دو صاف صاف اور کھلم کھلا طریقے سے جدا کرنا ہوگا۔ ایسا قانون نہ بنائے کہ جس کے معنی ہم کچھ سمجھیں اور ہم سے یہ کہ کر روٹ لیا جائے کہ ہم کھادی کی ترقی کے لئے اس کی مدد کے لئے یہ

بل پاس کر رہے ہیں۔ ہم ہینڈلوم کی بھی ترقی چاہتے ہیں مگر ہم اس کی ترقی پر کھادی کی قربانی نہیں کرنا چاہتے۔ آپ نے جو ہینڈلوم کلاتھ کی ڈیفینیشن دی ہے اس میں یہ تبدیلی ضرور ہونی چاہئے۔ یعنی

“Handloom cloth means any cloth woven by mill yarn.”

اس کا مطلب یہ ہوا کہ اس میں چرخے کا سوت استعمال نہیں کیا جا سکے گا۔ مگر آجکل ایسا نہیں ہو رہا ہے۔ سرکار کو اس بات کا بھی خیال رکھنا ہوگا کہ جو کواپریٹو سوسائٹیاں ہینڈلوم کا کپڑا بیچتی ہیں وہ اس کپڑے کو کھادی کے نام سے نہ بیچنے پائیں۔ آپ سب لوگوں کو جو کھادی کا کپڑا پہنتے ہیں اس کا تجربہ ہوگا کہ ہینڈلوم کا کپڑا جو کہ کھادی کے نام سے بکتا ہے اس کا سوت ملا ہونے کی وجہ سے عمدہ دکھائی دیتا ہے اور اس کی زیادہ قیمت مانگی جاتی ہے۔ تو اس قانون کو پاس کرتے وقت اس بات کا ضرور دھیان رکھیں کہ آجکل کھادی میں جو ملاوت ہینڈلوم کی ہو گئی ہے اور جو کہ بازاروں میں کھادی کے نام سے بک رہا ہے اس سے تو کھادی کا ہم کوئی بھلا نہیں کرینگے بلکہ ہینڈلوم کو ہی ہم ترقی دے رہے ہیں۔ ان سب چیزوں کے لئے آپ کو ٹھیک خاص قانون بنانا چاہئے جس سے کہ کھادی اور ہینڈلوم (الگ)

الگ ہو جائیں۔ جب تک آپ ایسا نہیں کرینگے تب تک آپ کھادی کی کسی طرح بھی ترقی نہیں کر سکیں گے۔ اگرچہ ہم یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہینڈلوم کی بھی ترقی ہو۔ مل کے کپڑے کی بھی ترقی ہو اور ہندوستان کی ہر چیز کی ترقی ہو مگر ہم یہ بات نہیں چاہتے کہ مہاتما گاندھی کا نام لے کر ہم اس چیز کو ترقی دیں جس چیز کو وہ نہیں چاہتے تھے اور ان کی چاہی ہوئی چیز کھادی کی کوئی ترقی نہ کریں۔

ہم اس بل کے ذریعہ کھادی کی حفاظت کرنے جا رہے ہیں تو اس بل میں یہی ایک خاص نقص ہے کہ ہینڈلوم اور کھادی میں کوئی فرق نہیں کیا گیا۔ لہذا جب تک ہم اس فرق کو دور نہ کر لیں تب تک ہم صحیح معنوں میں کھادی کی ترقی کے لئے کوئی کام نہیں کر سکیں گے اور نہ ہم کو شدہ کھادی مل سکیگی۔

اس کے ساتھ ساتھ اس بات کا بھی خیال رکھیں کہ آج پاورلوم والے آپ کے قانون کے بموجب مل کا سوت استعمال نہیں کر پاتے۔ میں کل ہی لدھیانہ گیا تو میں نے وہاں پر دیکھا کہ وہاں پر تقریباً تین ہزار پاورلوم سے لئے بیکار ہو گئے ہیں کہ آپ کے موجودہ قانون کی وجہ سے وہ مل کے سوت کو اپنے لوم میں نہیں چلا سکتے۔

[Khawaja Inait Ullah.] - -

اس طرح سے بہت سے چھوٹے چھوٹے
لوم بلند ہو گئے ہیں اور وہ کپڑا نہیں
بننا سکتے ہیں - اس کی طرف بھی
سرکار کو دیکھنا چاہئے -

ہمیں اس بات کا خیال رکھنا
چاہئے کہ ہمارے ہینڈلوم والے چرخے
کے سوت کو اور مل کے سوت کو ملا
کر اشدھ کھادی نہ بنانے پائیں - اس
کو شدھ ہی دھنے دیں -

[For English translation, see Appendix IV,
Annexure No. 103.]

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Mr. Deputy
Chairman. At the outset, with your permission
I would beseech the hon. Minister not to come
to this House with fantastic assertions, without
any statistical data to fall back upon. Sir, it is
not only today that we have felt the necessity
to protect the handloom industry. As long
back as 1940 a Committee on handlooms went
into the whole matter and in 1942 they
produced an extremely interesting report
wherein they made a number of suggestions.
So, necessarily, we expected that when the
Minister came with this measure, with this
Bill, which is ultimately going to be a
permanent taxation measure, he would have
made reference to that report and would have
let this House know what steps have been
taken to implement the suggestions embodied
in the said Report.

Sir, at the short time at my disposal I cannot
quote all the suggestions but here are a few
salient suggestions which the Committee made.
They referred to the handicaps of the weavers in
obtaining their yarn through a chain of
middlemen and suggested the practicability of
the mills selling yarn direct to the weavers.
Then they recommended that "the present
organisation of the marketing of handloom
products is a very costly one from the weavers'
point of view and the margin of the
middlemen's profit is also considerable,
ranging up to 47 per cent. '

Further difficulties are also experienced on
account of transport and want of
standardization of handloom goods" which
they wanted to be looked into. Thirdly they
suggested, "Handloom fabrics like Madras
handkerchiefs, sarongs and *lungis* command a
considerable export market in the countries of
the African and Asian Littorals. Such exports,
however, have been suffering a decline in
recent years owing to many factors such as the
mills' competition, change of fashions and
difficulties encountered in the matter of
exports. The entire export trade in handloom
fabrics appears to be defective and the system
needs proper organisation". Fourthly they said,
"The mills should be prohibited from
producing *gamchas*, dhotis and sarees of
coarse counts." Therefore at the outset before
this House considers this Bill, in the fitness of
things, I have a right to ask the Minister what
steps have been taken by the Government to
implement these very pertinent suggestions
made by the Committee which was appointed
by the Government itself.

And then, coming to khadi, Sir, at one stage
khadi was the very antithesis of handloom. Sir,
in 1922, when the khaddar movement was a-
foot, it was pointed out by that Committee that
the movement for khaddar gave a death-blow
to the handloom industry inasmuch as you
know, Sir, in those earlier days handlooms
were depending on imports from foreign
countries for fine yarn of superior quality. In
those days the production of fine or superfine
dhotis was conditioned by or was limited to
the import of cloths from foreign countries.
Therefore the market of the mills was captured
by the hand-loom. But when the khaddar
movement came and when a sort of certificate
was required to certify that a particular
handloom cloth was woven out of khaddar
yarns, it gave a death-blow to the handloom in-
dustry. It is only because of the fact that the
hand-spun khaddar could not possibly supply
the demand

of a growing handloom industry. This khaddar—with all due respect—I should say, is an economic superstition and we are going to bolster it up by a sentiment which has no basis in reality. It is also another astounding piece of extravagance on the part of Government to state in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that khadi makes its contribution towards the relief of rural unemployment and provides supplementary sources of livelihood to our agricultural population. This is too generalized a statement which may mean anything on earth. If we go to the Five Year Plan, what do we find? We find that that bulky document made a reference of only 4 lines to khadi. On page 323 they observe that certain tentative proposals for khadi programme have been prepared but these have to be considered by the proposed Khadi and Village Industries Board. So we expected that the Government would have told us what were the proposals of the khadi and Village Industries Board before we were asked to give our sanction to this measure. I don't know how many yards of hand-spun khadi are produced every year. I have got the figure for 1941. In 1941 the quantity of hand-spun yarn was 54.5 million lbs. If we calculate that 4 yards of cloth can be produced out of 1 lb. of yarn, then the total production will be 217.6 million yards of cloth produced out of hand-spun yarn, but the total production of handloom cloth in the same year stands at 1643 million yards. Therefore we can find that this khadi is 1/8th or less of the total production of handloom cloth. Khadi never provides for any employment to the partly employed or unemployed. It might have abundantly provided employment in the corridors of the Secretariat buildings, to the licence hunters or to persons engaged in other shady trades but I don't think they require any protection from the Government. Khadi was once the Coat-of-Arms of the fighters of the national freedom. Today it is the Coat-of-Arms of persons engaged in the blackmarket. To-

day, it is a device to hide everything that is black and apart from that sentimental point of view, we have no right here to tax the consumers for a mere sentiment. In my State there was a Khadi Adviser. With your permission, Sir, I would here cite an illustration how under the aegis of a Government that stands by khadi, khadi is being improved. A gentleman who could not seek his election was appointed as Khadi Adviser and though he was supposed to be honorary, he was getting a daily allowance of Rs. 40, and a huge palatial building was maintained for the khadi welfare. Though the organization was supposed to have its Headquarters at Cuttack, for T. A. purposes his Headquarters was his own village, some 40 miles away from Cuttack. The consumers have been exploited in order to run a parallel volunteer organization of the Indian National Congress. It was said this morning that there has been a token provision made of one crore for khadi and one crore for handlooms. So it suggests that probably a sort of parity would be maintained in allocating funds for khadi and handlooms. By no stretch of imagination a parity can be established between khadi and handloom. Therefore my submission is that if the Government is determined to pass through this legislation as they seem to be, then they should omit khadi from the purview of their consideration. Khadi came into being by the spontaneous feelings of the people when Mahatma Gandhi propagated it. He did not require any protection from Government. It was a spontaneous feeling of the people that brought khadi into being and I think those people who are today bringing in the name of Mahatma Gandhi to make the passage of the Bill easier should consider whether they are not insulting that Great Soul who never wanted any Government protection but believed only in one's individual efforts. Of course I have moved an amendment and at that stage I will refer to other things but one thing I have to add viz., it should be made clear-

[Shri S. Mahanty.] from now that this cess should be paid by the textile industry and should not be borne by the consumers. Already the textile industry has raised a bogey that they have been taxed to the extent of Rs. 50 crores per year due to excise and other duties but they are certainly not paying it out of their profits as the consumers are made to pay them. Just now there has been a reduction in export duty on cloth and the textile industry has got that profit and it is amazing that after the textile industry extorted that profit out of Government—it raised the price of exportable cloth by 5 to 10 per cent.

'So there is no justice or equity in saying that the consumers of India should pay this Rs. 5 crores which the Government anticipate to raise out of this cess. Therefore, though it is late, I still hope that good sense will prevail upon the Government and they should see that this cess is paid by the industry and not by the consumers.

BEGAM AIZAZ RASUL (Uttar Pradesh): Sir. I rise to support this Bill and I congratulate the hon. Minister for Commerce and Industry for bringing forward this very important measure. This is one of the greatest constructive legislation that our Government has enacted and I think that it deserves all the congratulation that the House and the country can give them. Ordinarily I am not in favour of any more taxation or cess being levied upon the people but one pice per yard only is being levied and I feel that it is such a negligible amount and also the purpose for which it is being levied is so great that I don't think that the public will ■ at all mind this small cess being levied upon it.

Sir, so many speeches have been made here and I am afraid that certain motives have been imputed for bringing forward this legislation.* I am sorry that this has been so because the step that has been taken has been taken in the right direction and therefore I don't think that it is at all fair for any action of the House

to impute any motive to this legislation.

It has been said that the South—Madras State—will benefit more by this measure than any other State. I do not see any justification for this complaint at all. I feel that even if it is a fact that the Madras State or the South does benefit by this measure, it should be welcomed and everyone should extend his help in working it. This, Sir, is an economic measure which affects the whole country. Spinning and weaving constitute a profession in our land which has been carried on by our people from most ancient times, especially in the countryside. Therefore I do not think this measure is confined to any particular portion or State of our country. We must look at India as a whole and not in terms of this or that State, and if any one province or State benefits by a measure, why should we grudge it that benefit? But really I do not see how only Madras State alone will benefit from this measure. I come from a State—the Uttar Pradesh—where the handloom industry has existed for long. Who has not heard of the weavers of Banaras, of Azamgarh and of Sandila? I come from the last-named place where more than a thousand looms work and thus provide good and gainful employment to the people, especially the poor people. I do not think that anyone can really say anything against this measure. In fact, this provides employment not only to the men, but also to the women. The women get a great deal of employment as they can work in their own homes, spin and weave and turn out cloth not only for their own use but also for supplying to the market. They feel that they are not only contributing to the economic progress of the country but also contributing materially to their own homes. This is a very good feeling and should be encouraged as much as possible. Therefore this is a measure that benefits all and it tends to improve their conditions of life and it should certainly be supported by all sections of the public as well as all Members of this House.

As I have said, spinning and weaving constitute a very ancient profession in our country and people have been engaged in it from very ancient times. Besides this, it is the implementation of our Five Year Plan and on that score also this measure should be welcomed and we should encourage this industry—khadi and cottage industries of our country—as well as strengthen the Government's hands in imposing such justified taxation as will improve the lot of the large majority of our population. The money that will be received by the imposition of this cess will be spent—as has been laid down in the Bill—for the improvement of conditions of our workers and I have no doubt that this will be properly done and that this will go a long way to improve their conditions. I hope, Sir, that it will be seen that more and more facilities are provided to these handloom workers and khadi workers and that their conditions are made better and better. There is no doubt that these workers are working under great handicaps and in very bad conditions. Every effort must be made to improve their conditions, to organize them on economic lines.

The hon. Minister this morning in his speech spoke about co-operative societies. I have some experience of weavers' societies since, as I have said before, I come from a place where there are a good many hand-loom workers and so I know these co-operative societies are doing very good work. There may be some societies which may not be doing all that is expected of them in the matter of helping and guiding the weavers in the manner necessary; but one of the things aimed by this Bill is to see that these societies are set up everywhere and are put on a better basis in order to help the weavers as much as possible.

5 P.M.

One thing I must say and that is this. The greatest drawback these weavers and their societies suffer from is the want of supply of yarn.

They experience this dearth of yarn and it is very necessary for Government to see that more yarn is supplied to these weavers. That is the greatest drawback from which these weavers suffer. They have to sit idle for days and months at a time on account of this shortage of yarn and therefore I hope that Government will pay very very close attention to this and provide more yarn to the weavers and thus help them in a matter where they require help most.

Sir, I have very great pleasure in supporting this measure.

PROF. G. RANGA (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am very glad to extend my whole-hearted support to this Bill. So many things have been said by our friends, about the failure of the Government to do this and that and many suggestions have been made as to how these two sister industries—the khadi and handloom industries—ought to be helped and can be helped. To implement any of these suggestions or even to have been able to carry out any of these things in the past, one needed money and even now one needs money and the most important thing that this Bill seeks to do is to raise that money and place it at the disposal of the Government, that is to say, at the disposal of the nation in this shape. Once you have got that money then it will be for us to make our suggestions and expect those suggestions to be carried out, to suggest plans and expect them also to be implemented, and it is in this direction. I take it, that this Bill is designed, as pointed out by the hon. Minister this morning, the aim is to help the handloom weavers, the handloom weaving industry as well as the cottage industries.

Secondly I consider it—I have said it elsewhere also—that the principle embodied in this Bill and the determination that it stands for is self-evident, if any evidence were needed, that another social revolution is today in being in our country. One social revolution was inaugurated

[Prof. G. Ranga.] and is nearing completion, by the abolition of the zamindari system. It was more a negative thing though it would have a positive effect when you improve the lot of our peasantry. This one I am referring to now is a positive revolution and at the same time it has a negative aspect also. In course of time, as my hon. friend the professor was suggesting, the mill industry might come to an end and be eliminated in this country so far as textiles go. We do not know whether we will be able to achieve that. But it may come to have that negative result. I call it a social revolution because as some other friend had suggested, 200 years before, khadi was everywhere. Meanwhile the mill industry came in and destroyed the very source of employment of millions and millions in our country and impoverished them and impoverished the country. Now we have taken in hand the responsibility of rehabilitating these people and providing them employment and providing them with full employment if that is possible, if not, at least some employment and while thus employed, give them some assurance that they will get some income, some decent income.

This is a new determination. This is to stem the tide of western industrialisation as it has come down to us. We are up against it not because there is something inherently wrong in it but because we have here other elements which are in abundance, one of them being human labour; whereas in other countries there is a need for them to economise human labour, here, in our country, we are able to economise capital and several other capital equipment because we do not have them. On the other hand, we have this labour capital and we must make use of it in the most humane fashion. It is in this way that we have begun to think differently. My hon. friend Mr. Mahanti was saying that this

khadi is a kind of economic superstition. I contest it. I wrote a thesis called "Economics of Khadi". It was published in the *Indian Journal of Economics*, which was supposed to be a scientific journal. Ever since then, I have been pursuing that line. So finally other economists! have come round to that viewpoint. That was not my point of view; on the other hand, it was Mahatma Gandhi who encouraged that in our country and today if anyone were to quote to us the text books of England and Europe and of America to say that this khadi is not economical at all, I can only say that these gentlemen are reactionary in so far as economic studies go with special reference to our own economic conditions. Here khadi is *par excellence*, best suited and provides subsidiary employment to our scores of millions of underemployed people. Let our people only remember what sort of work we are able to provide to the millions of our people who are famished, who are famine-stricken during those periods when rains fail in different parts of the country. The usual work that is provided to them is stone-breaking even to women and children, in terrible heat. Is not khadi a more humane kind of work, better paying work, more decent work? Does it not yield results? It does. At the same time, everybody knows that out of the *money* you spend on famine relief work you really get in terms of the usual orthodox economics only eight annas worth and the other eight annas worth is lost and that is the subsidy. It is not only subsidy, it is also unemployment relief. If we are not able to provide complete employment to all the people who are unemployed here in this country at least let us try to do something in that direction. Khadi gives you the civilised means, humane means by which you can possibly provide relief to those people who are suffering in our country. You realise their sufferings only when they are on the brink of starvation, that is famine. It is the duty of all civilised people to realise their duties and the duties of the Government not only during

the times of famine but also during ordinary times when our people are under-nourished, and under-employed and it is from that point of view that khadi stands on its own and khadi has no fear at all of losing its place. It will lose its place when the Government here—whatever the Government may be—loses its faith in human values or, on the other hand, if something happens in our country by which out of our 350 million people, 250 million people are destroyed and only 100 million people are left to carry on the productive resources where we need not have resort to khadi at all. Therefore, khadi has got a permanent place. How much money is to be given to khadi is another thing. I would rather my hon. friend the Minister in charge would make up his mind as soon as possible in regard to this matter. Out of six crores of rupees that we are going to get, let us decide how much we are going to place at the disposal of khadi, one crore, two crores or three crores and if it is necessary I am sure, I hope the hon. Minister would be willing to raise this cess, to raise funds and come to the rescue of these two industries.

Coming to the handloom weaving industry, the credit side of it, I am sure my hon. friend is rather inclined to look at it in a light-hearted manner. I fear he is inclined to be too optimistic about the response that he expects to get from the Reserve Bank of India. My friend Mr. Parikh has already estimated that the handloom industry would need Rs. 25 crores to finance it.' How much out of this will the handloom weavers be able to get from the Reserve Bank of India today is well worth studying. I do not think Reserve Bank can be expected to make such a response. Therefore, I would like my hon. friend to consider favourably the suggestion made by the Handloom Weavers' Congress from Madras as well as on the all-India plane that a portion of this money should be set

22 CSD

aside as a matter of investment trust for financing handloom weavers. Except for that, in regard to the other ways in which the handloom weaving industry can be developed, I find the scope given in this Bill and, therefore, I am in favour of these things.

Then, Sir, my friend the deputy leader of the Socialist Party charged Government with want of planned policy and he thought it was rather vague. He read, I think, some extracts from Out of page 183 in this volume of the National Planning Commission's Report. I do not think it is vague. Government has a plan today. Now, the reservation itself is a part of the plan; this cess is itself a part of the plan; the appointment of the Board is part of the plan and their decision to establish a number of research stations is a part of the plan. I can go on like this. At long last Government has come out with a plan and I wish to congratulate them and whatever might be the reasons, whether it is rivalry between the Chief Minister of Madras and the Minister here or whether it is because of the anxiety of all those to relieve the sufferings of our electorate, whatever might be the reasons, the real reason is to help those people who number 11 per cent. Somebody said that there was some politics. How can there not be when there is a democratic Government. We went there to the people and my hon. friend, Mr. Rama Rao has rightly said, we went to the people, sought their franchise, made promises to them that we are going to protect these handloom weaving industries and cottage industries and if the Government comes forward and says "here are these 11 per cent, of the people who are employed on handloom, on these cottage industries and, therefore, we propose these measures for their relief", how does it lie in the mouth to simply say, to simply weaken the strength behind this Bill and say that it has politics behind it. Certainly it is political and I am glad that this has been

[Prof. G. Ranga.] brought forward by them and I wish to congratulate them on it. The question was raised between one region and another region. In England, when the coal industry went into depression, the iron and steel industry went into depression—that was South Wales—the whole of England rose to a man, contributed more than £100 million and helped those people because they were living in disturbed areas. If it so happens, whether it is in the South or whether it is in the North or wherever it may be, that large enough number of people, good enough number of people are suffering from any kind of depression, then it is the duty of the whole of India, of the Government of India to come to the rescue and place funds at their disposal and other resources also in order to help them. Government did a splendid thing in providing work in Rayalaseema and Mysore and now they are doing the same thing in Maharashtra and other areas. In the same way and in the same spirit, they are now coming to the House for this measure. Is it their fault that they have these in such large numbers in South India? I was surprised, I was shocked; I am sorry I was not present when that argument was being made and, therefore, I cannot answer it properly because I do not know how the argument was raised but the kind of argument that was raised that this is likely to help some South Indians somewhere in South India to a greater extent is something which is wrong.

Sir, I have many more points to make but I have not got the time and, therefore, what I would like to say is that I do not agree with my hon. friend from the Socialist Party when he said that this Bill is intended to cushion the gradual extinction of handloom weavers. I do not think....

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: I did not say that. I said if these measures were not part of a definite policy, it might have that effect.

PROF. G. RANGA: Right, I stand corrected. I can assure my hon. friend, whether this Government comes forward with this Bill or not, the handloom weavers are not going to give up their professions. For the last 200 years they have remained loyal to their profession in spite of the great neglect that was heaped upon them by the British Government and other troubles that were created by the British Government. All credit, all glory to these people who have stuck to their crafts and art. But, with this, their position is going to be improved. Therefore, there would be no fear at all of any gradual extinction of these people.

(Time bell rings.)

And I wish to congratulate my hon. friend Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari upon the great good luck that he has had in being the sponsor of this Bill. I am sure everyone of these Members here who have gone to jails for the sake of khadi industry, with this khadi on their shoulders and on their heads and for whose sake they received baton charges from the British policemen, would have been proud to have had the privilege of being the sponsor of this Bill and I am not surprised, Sir, that there are such a large crop of Members in this House who have been very anxious to speak in its favour, whether it gets them the vote or not, they will have the satisfaction that here is a Bill which they can support wholeheartedly and here is a Government and a Minister whom, whatever their differences with him, they would like to embrace because he has come forward with a Bill which gives some sort of inclining of the mind of Mahatma Gandhi.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: As a plover of charkha, as an exclusive and habitual wearer of khadi for the last 33 years, and as a firm believer in its great potentialities, I rise to support the measure known as the Khadi and Other Handloom Industries Development (Additional Excise Duty on

Cloth) Bill, 1953. I am so much upset by the fact that I shall not be able to cover even one-fourth of what I have got to say in connection with this Bill. The one request I would make to the hon. Members of this House is this: Whether they wear a Turkish cap, or whether they wear a felt cap or whether they go naked they should not—and they dare not—talk disparagingly of khadi, because it would be cruel on their part to hurt the feelings of those who have got a great sanctity attached behind khadi. Khadi, for me, Sir, has got a historical background. It has a very very long association with all of us who believe in the cult of khadi. I will remind hon. Members who may have copies of the *Young India* to find them out and read what the great Mahatma had to say about khadi. One of his leading articles in *Young India* was styled "The Music of the Wheel". We all know that we, in a sense, worshipped khadi because it stood for all that we stood for.

“मेरा टूट न चरखेँ का तार चरखा चालू रहे”

This was our song, day in and day out. Now it has been said that it has a political flavour. It was our uniform; but then you have only to practise it in order to realise what it meant to us. Suppose I am going on foot in a deserted place where I know nobody. I happen to come across a man who is wearing a *kurta* made of khadi. I at once realise a sort of affinity, a sort of oneness with that man and I enquire from him what I have got to enquire. That is the spirit, that is the sentiment, the likeness and the closeness that khadi gave us. People who have never done that, who have never practised it, do not and cannot appreciate it. It inculcated a feeling of fraternity, developed a sense of brotherhood, and betokened peace, serenity, humility and oneness of purpose, unlike the red cap which gives the present-day wearers of it a sort of apish appearance. Sir, I would remind my hon. friends of the

movements and the inter-movements of the weft and the warp. The weft and the warp of the spinning machine, out of which hand-spun yarn and khadi was made, taught us how to live such lives as are woven and interwoven with the give and take of human adjustments and emotions. The same attitude I want to extend to my friends. I have always been trying to extend to my friends on the opposite benches that attitude, but, unfortunately, I have to say regretfully that it has never been reciprocated.

Sir, the charkha concentrates your mind and trains your eyes. Your attention is drawn back from all manner of evil intentions and bad things, and from wishing ill of other people. You feel yourself to be a sanctified sort of man. And I again submit that this can be the experience of only those who have done it.

Now, Sir, khadi has been opposed from various points of view. A certain gentleman who happens to be a medical man said elsewhere, that khadi was dead. I would request that gentleman to get his stethoscope set right because there must be something wrong if he cannot distinguish between a dead thing and a living thing. Khadi is as dashing today as it was ever before. No matter if Mahatmaji is not living now, but khadi shall live, must live and khadi will be one of those articles of cloth which may one day replace mill made cloth to a greater extent than it has up till now. Then he also said that khadi smacked of politics. My hon. friend Mr. Ranga has just said, and so did my very dear friend, Mr. Rama Rao, that there is nothing unusual if people find a smell of politics in khadi. I wish that everyone of us was wearing khadi so that we could give a united front to the whole world and that can only be done if, at least from now on, my friends on the opposite took to wearing khadi. The hon. Minister for Commerce & Industry admitted that

[Shri H. P. Saksena.] this measure was a taxation measure. True, and I am always opposed to taxation measures, because taxation has reached to such a limit that it is cruel and unpardonable to go on taxing poor people more and more. But then this taxation measure is a measure which receives my wholehearted support and the reason for it is that it is going to draw out from a very calamitous position an industry which has been the very sustenance for the existence of lakhs and lakhs of people in this country, since long. The mother of the late Maulana Mohammad Ali whom I had the pleasure of hearing one evening at Lucknow said that when she was married—she was a lady of 80 years of age then, that is in 1922 or 1923—all the cloth that was given to her as dowry, all the cloth that was used in connection with her marriage was hand-spun and hand-woven. Sir, with that background, can anyone, now say that the cloth of the hand-loom industry or khadi should not be encouraged? For me the three varieties of cloth are like gold, silver and copper. Khadi is, naturally enough gold for me, handloom cloth silver, and mill made cloth is copper. I did appreciate and admire the solicitude which my friend Mr. Parikh showed for the consumers, but then there was something of the bias for the millowners in that great effort that he made for the consumers.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time is up.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Please give me a loan of a few minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister refuses to give any loan.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Now, Sir, I do not at all agree with my esteemed friend Shri Deoki Nandan Narayan that mills should be abolished. I am not in favour of the abolition of mills.

Mills shall have to stay. They must stay, and even when the whole of India begins to wear handloom cloth and khadi, even then mills will go on, because we do need resources for the purchase of foreign materials for our use, and that can be done only when we have exported something which we ourselves have manufactured.

Sir, there was a very eminent physician some time ago who was asked whether he knew the treatment of all manner of maladies. He said, "Yes", and he was asked, "Is it really so?" He said, "Yes". But after a little reflection, he said there was one disease at least for which he knew no remedy. "What is that disease, pray?", he was asked, and he said, "Suspicion is a disease for which I have no treatment." Sir, a very honourable Member, a very eminent Member, intelligent to the core, was very doubtful whether this was not a political measure and whether it was not brought under political pressure. Why try to probe into the matter, I ask. Why try to find out whether it has been brought under political pressure or whether it has been brought as a compromise between two Members of the same party? That should not be your concern. Where is the necessity for probing into all these matters? The hon. Member is labouring under a very grave suspicion. For this there is no remedy.

With these words, I wholeheartedly support the measure that is before the House.

THE MINISTER FOR COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (SHRI T. T. KRISHNA -MACHARI): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I must apologise to the House for taxing its time and patience in the manner in which I have done and making it sit in the afternoon. I know some hon. Members took exception to the hurry with which we are trying to get the Bill through. The circumstances are known to them.

Nevertheless I am grateful to the hon. Members of this House for very patiently accommodating the Government and myself in this matter. The fact that 19 hon. Members have spoken on this Bill, at any rate, revealed that there has been no hustling. Some of them took nearly half an hour, and all points of view were canvassed, and all this has brought out a large measure of agreement with the proposals which Government have outlined before the House. The basis of all these proposals has been the question of levying a cess of excise duty on mill-made cloth.

To a very large extent the speeches made by hon. critics of the Bill or critics of parts of the Bill and critics of Government policy have been answered by other hon. Members, not merely on this side of the House, but also by good friends like Professor Ranga. This has made my task a comparatively easy one, except perhaps that I shall have to refer to one or two speeches which have so far highlighted the debate of the day. The first speech that I should like to mention is that of Shri Deoki Nandan Narayan. He of course believes in khadi in the absolute sense; he will accept no compromise. And he wanted a statement of policy here and now. I do not know whether a Minister can commit the Government, or whether for that matter a policy so transcendental in its scope can be outlined by Government without an adequate discussion by both Houses of Parliament and a vote in favour of that policy. He wanted it here and now declared that there will be no further installation of looms, and no further permission to establish spinning units either. Well, he presents the extreme point of view. I do respect the opinions that he has expressed, because they arise out of conviction and a firm belief that in future not merely the powerlooms should go but also spinning mills should go. There is hardly any meeting point so far as we are concerned.

The second point that the hon. Member made was slightly contradictory. After all, when people speak of first principles, contradiction is inevitable. Being a Member of this House and having to reconcile previous attitudes to present ones, he said there should be complete reservation of dhotis and sarees for handlooms. That, however, would mean that spinning mills should go off. I think Shri Rajagopal Naidu or some other hon. Member pointed out that handlooms depended on the spinning mills. So, there is a slight resiling from the position that he had originally taken up. "Well, I would at once say what I should have said if I had not said it that our vision at the moment does not extend very far, and that we are looking more or less within the period of the Plan. The proposals that I have outlined here are more or less exploratory, and I am not ahjjjite go as far as he wants me to go. oir:

The next outstanding pronouncement came from my very respected friend Dr. Kunzru. I labour under a certain amount of disadvantage in answering Dr. Kunzru, because he does know my mind in most matters. He thinks, Sir, I used to know me some yeags^jBK, that I am an uncompromising person. Well, Sir, I do recognise that there is some value in being more or less an uncompromising adherent of certain principles. But if you have to serve the people, if one gets into a team of people, compromise is very essential. It may be that from the point of view of the character which I possess, which Dr. Kunzru perhaps approved in the past, there has been a sliding down. But others may perhaps say that I have become a little more human. But the object that Dr. Kunzru has, and one for which we all respect him and I imitate him, is that we should serve our people. In so doing, we do accept compromises. There is no point in my saying all this, that this is the view that I hold, which we have learnt from Marshall and which

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.] has subsequently been upheld by Keynes, and this is the modern economic *view*, that I am not prepared to budge from it, that in a country where poverty is the common factor ■economics of that type has no place. We have got to think of the present •conditions here. Dr. Kunzru will understand, please, that I can neither resent anybody expressing a view which is contrary to my own, nor anybody criticising me for not holding an opinion which I ought to. But it would be wrong and I would be doing injustice to the position that I hold that I should, because I hold a particular view, stop progress in other directions.

Sir, one thing Dr. Kunzru said which, I am afraid, hurt me a little. Dr. Kunzru knows me very well. He said: "Well, this is a political measure." We are politicians; and everyone of us is a politician. If we were not political animals, we would not have got freedom. If we were not political animals, we would not have taken the risk of running political democracy with its pitfalls, snags and handicaps. The very fact that you are listening to others' speeches in the House shows that you are politicians. You can speak after all only for half an hour and you have got *to* listen to others the rest of your time. We are all political animals and' we accept the obligations arising therefrom. Apart from that, I would like to assure my hon. friend, and I think he will do me the justice of continuing to believe that I am nohest, that political principles or pressure tactics did not in *any* sense entirely guide me in this matter. Take for instance the question of reservation of 60 per cent. Well, that was a compromise. It was a compromise and at the same time it was indicated very clearly that it was just an experiment. For instance, I did not believe, with the inadequate data that was available to me, that I could, as an executive of Government, issue a *Hukum* saying "Well, the mills cannot produce any dhotis and sarees", because I do know that in these matters of economics the question of the water

finding its level does not come. Opportunities that are produced in one area do not go to another area freely. A number of impediments take place. It may be that in Madras more handloom cloth is produced or more could be produced. But that does not mean that it would go to U.P. or Bihar. Facts are undoubtedly true that U.P. takes the largest quantity of mill-made dhotis. Bihar takes the largest quantity of mill-made sarees and Bengal takes a fairly large quantity— more or less an equal quantity— of mill-made sarees and dhotis, I think 5400 bales. U.P. takes about 8900 bales of dhotis and if I want these areas to be supplied not merely from the local handlooms, but also from Madras, I cannot possibly ignore the fact that cloth is in category VIII so far as priorities are concerned and also for purposes of railway freight. If I want to supply these areas from Madras, not merely the difference nbw between mill-made production and hand-made production will operate against it, but railway freights will operate terribly against it. So, when a proposition is made that we should straightaway ban manufacture of dhotis and sarees, obviously it is a thing which no Government can accept.

Then, Sir, my hon. friend Dr. Kunzru said that we have appointed the Textile Inquiry Committee and why not wait? Well, I agree, Sir that is the logical thing to do. but that is not the humane thing to do. Logical and human ideas do not always go hand-in-hand. If I were a pure logician, I shall be a monster. I do not say that Dr. Kunzru forgets the human aspect because all his life he has spent in the cause of service to the people and it is no use my trying to score a debating point, saying that Dr. Kunzru has no human touch, but at the moment the intellectual in him has slightly overpowered his natural and habitual instinct oi only serving the people. Well, I shouk like to assure Dr. Kunzru that is ex actly *my* rtrst reaction. I did feel tha here we are appointing a committee. W

want a demarcation of spheres, if possible, in relation to the social objectives. If my hon. friend would refer to the terms of reference, he would find utilisation of manpower and resources—that is socially most desirable. I think those are the words used in those terms of reference. Some people believed that it will produce a heaven. After all we want to try it. We said: "Well, let us take 1951-52" which in one sense was the peak year for the production of dhotis because in the previous year, the production was so low that there was scarcity everywhere and high prices were ruling and in fact that gave a certain amount of impetus to the handloom industry. So we took the year 1950-51 and then we said that the total production of dhotis was somewhere about 50,000 bales as an average production. Now we thought there may not be any great scarcity. Still it is an experiment worth while trying. Well, there is also the other method. So far as Bombay and Ahmedabad are concerned. Government have to give permits for wagon space; otherwise the Railway priority does not operate. The demand of the Government of Madras has been varying from about 700, 1300, 1700 and so on. You might even say that does not seem to give the relief that is necessary, but I think it has certainly given relief. On the other hand, there are complaints from other parts of India. I think some hon. Member from Bengal complained about production in Bengal. Well, we are trying to allow some adjustment in areas where we find scarcity. We are willing to relax the limit of 60 per cent, to some extent, but what happens really is this. Well, there is scarcity because we have asked all the mills, that normally produce dhotis, to produce only 60 per cent. Certain mills in the outlying areas take advantage of that scarcity and produce not merely 60 per cent., not merely 80 per cent., not merely 100 per cent., but 250 per cent, of what they originally produced because they think here is a chance of making money. Naturally they go to the Government and the Government sometimes support them. We can see

essentially that we are going to permit some mills to produce 250 per cent, of what they were producing in 1950-51. So you can see that these are practical problems and only for some time. But if the Committee says that there are other means of helping the handloom industry, well, we are certainly prepared to reconsider the position and accept the recommendations of the Committee in so far as handlooms are concerned.

Sir, the other point made by Dr. Kunzru was: What about other industries? It is true, Sir, but we are not considering the other industries. One at a time, I would like to humbly mention to the House, is good enough for me. After all, I am not a very capable person; I am a human being and I have got only 16 or 17 hours a day to work and I think this is enough headache for the time being before I start something else. But I would like certainly to do something for the leather industry in U.P. Again, if I start doing something for the leather industry, it will be said that I am concentrating on a South Indian industry because essentially, the leather industry is a South Indian industry. The cottage thing may be the emphasis in the U.F. but as an industry it is essentially a South Indian industry and I can speak with authority. I was not guided merely by the figures which had been placed before me. I sent four investigators and got them to make an actual physical survey of the various areas and what they produced. I have all those figures before me which I have not finalised but I have got a rough idea of what South India is making or has to make in proportion to what exists elsewhere. Then, Sir, we wanted to know certain figures. Well, I would ask hon. Members of this House to take all these figures not merely with a grain of salt but with a very big pinch of salt because I am not at all sure in my mind if these figures are correct. The figures and the statistics have been built up in the past and the incentive for cloth looms has been greater than in any other field merely

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.]

because of the fact of an allocation of quota and quota meant sale of the quota. I can mention an instance, a story I heard which I mentioned to the other House. An hon. friend from Mysore told me that a watchman in one of the factories in Mysore complained, "I come from Salem. I am given only Rs. 60 with which I could get on till recently because I had a quota card which I allowed to be utilised by another and he used to pay me some money. But today that quota card is valueless because yarn is available freely and so the Rs. 60 wages which they give me as a watchman is not enough." But anyway I could mention to Dr. Kunzru that on 1951 basis Bihar had 1,96,218 looms; Bombay 1 lakh 61 thousand and odd; Madras 8,40,000; Orissa 1,29,000; U.P. 2,53,000. I do not include Assam here because it has a different type of loom. U.P. com?; next to Madras Maybe U.P. people are as clever or less clever. And he also referred to the Planning Commission's Report. On page 9 the planners say, "The imposition of a cess on a large-scale industry for the benefit of the corresponding cottage industry may have two objects. The first object may be to equalise the difference in their costs of production. We believe that the scope for the imposition of a cess for achieving this object is limited and in any event, such a measure should be taken only after a careful investigation by an appropriate body. On the other hand, if the problems of the large-scale industry and the cottage industry are viewed in terms of a common production programme and it is recognised that improvement in the efficiency and growth of the cottage industry are basically in the interest of the development of the industry as a whole, it is legitimate to suggest that the organised sector of the industry may provide, by means of a small cess, the means for promoting technical improvement and organisation in the weaker and the unorganised sector." The planners are also intellectuals, may I mention to Dr. Kunzru? They have

their doubts like all intellectuals. But it is a very intellectual appraisal of a very difficult physical problem but almost it insists on an immediate solution.

Sir, on the question of hurry, well, as I said I apologise to the House, but I do think, Sir, some things are only done in a hurry and this Bill is an instance in point. If I am persistent I go round to the Secretary of the Assembly, I go to the Chairman or the Vice-Chairman and say, "Let me get it through because I want money urgently for such and such purpose". It simply cannot be done on files in the Secretariat. I have learnt, Sir, after 11 months and a day in office today—I do not know if I have outlived my usefulness—I have found that nothing is done unless somebody goes round and hustles and in my case I have not merely to go and hustle people elsewhere but I have got to hustle my own people from table to table and get things done, otherwise things are never done. Personally speaking, I am a believer in hurry. It is better to have a few things done in a hurry than to follow the other alternative of not doing anything at all. Dr. Kunzru said that to organise the co-operative societies will take a long time. I agree that there are limitations. But the whole trouble about it is, as a nation we would put off till tomorrow what we can possibly do today. It might be a very good administrative concept but we are trying to catch up for the lack of development over a period of 250 years and naturally we have to hurry. I may say, Sir, if I have the powers here I would make Parliament sit down for 18 hours a day and get through the necessary legislation and the powers sought therein and get about working. We have to be in a hurry this time and I am not ashamed at all of being accused of being in a hurry. I hope they won't say I am inefficient at the same time

Sir, the next speech which I had the good fortune of hearing, as usual, comes from my friend Shri B. C. Ghose and he wanted that more light should have

been thrown on the subject. Again that, is a fact which Dr. Kunzru also mentioned. So it is not that I have taken this House to be not aware of the fact that it has complete control over myself, my Ministry and their actions. What I meant when I said 'parliamentary control' was this. I indicated that "Here we have a token grant of one crore of rupees for handloom. although we do propose to spend 6 crores of rupees, 51 crores of rupees this year and the balance later and we shall come to you with supplementary proposals later on for expenditure". Therefore the token grant is there to enable us to go ahead and when actually making a commitment we shall come back to you. So far as the proposals are concerned I have very broadly indicated what the proposals are in regard to handlooms. I cannot draw up these proposals in isolation. They have got to be integrated with the ideas that the States have in this regard. It is because I do believe that to a certain extent decentralization is necessary. So long as the main objective would be served I am prepared to decentralize but all that I want is that money must be properly spent. It must go to the man who deserves it and that satisfies me and it should not go to some intermediary. There my hon. friend Mr. Rajagopal Naidu treated me as having become a convert to co-operation. I may tell my hon. friend that as a student I do believe in co-operation. The only trouble is in this and as a practical man I believe that co-operation is always voluntary but there is a certain amount of compulsion which I realise as a practical co-operator. That is the difference between him and myself. Practical co-operation means that there is decentralisation of some kind and we want to achieve some results by means of co-operation. I would like to avoid the element of compulsion but you cannot escape it and Government will be there in its own.

Hon. Members mentioned the failure of the co-operative societies in the past. It is a fact and so we have got to keep a careful check on them but it is

not that I do not believe in them.

Well, Sir, these are roughly the proposals but I must wait for the State Governments to formulate their budgets and we have to be guided by the proposals that they bring forward before us. I can tell my hon. friend Mr. Rajagopal Naidu that by merely shifting the words—it is only the lawyer who thinks that shifting of words influences the whole society—I mean the replacing of the word 'may' by the word 'shall'—nothing really happens. If suppose nothing is going to be done, whether it be 'shall' or 'may' will not improve matters. The putting in of the word 'shall' in place of 'may' does not in the context of that particular clause improve upon it. It only says that such and such things should be done. The insertion of the word 'shall' in place of 'may' means nothing. If I cannot spend the money I cannot spend the money. There is no use saying "If I put in the word 'shall' you will spend the money." It is only for devoting the money raised by this Bill for certain specific purposes that this Bill has been brought forward. It is not to throw it away that the money is raised. That kind of compulsion on our Government by putting the word 'shall' in place of 'may' is meaningless because by compelling the Government in that context the aim can be defeated and you will achieve nothing even by putting the word 'shall' in place of 'may'. We do hope, Sir, that the Provincial Governments will take advantage of the offer that has been made and formulate their proposals and accept our advice which will only be more or less what you might call a clearing house of the experience of the various Governments. U.P. has gone forward in a certain line in their co-operative endeavour. Bombay has taken a mixed step forward and Madras, as everybody knows, has made co-Operation a success to a very large degree.

6 P.M.

The point that my friend Mr. Ghose wants is—if I have got down correctly—that the Government should here and now state its policy

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.] clearly. But I can tell him that a statement of policy like that in a matter like this has no more significance than what Mr. Ghose does when he goes to Ganges and does his SankalD and then says 'It ail goes by the board'. We are greatly in earnest. You cannot expect us to be more earnest. We are in deadly earnest to do something for the hand-loom weaver, for tackling the problem of unemployment. The trouble that we have is whatever we do, no isolated or series of acts will really succeed thoroughly. We have to try from various angles, from different angles. That is why I don't accept any argument -which is based on absolute ideas. Our approach has necessarily to be pragmatic. The question was asked—Are Government prepared to give adequate protection? Yes, if it is necessary and if the purpose would be served. As Dr. Kunzru said, let us see what the Committee is going to say in regard to reservation of particular spheres. The protection just now given is to cushion the effects of high prices. Provide them with an organisation and also provide them with facilities of presenting all their products in a way that people will buy. That is what we intend to do. But the Planning Commission are also, my hon. friend says, vague. I am not an apologist of the Planning Commission. In fact I am surprised that they are not more vague -than what they are because the attempt of the Planning Commission covers the entire field. If they had been more precise, they would have become terminological. The Planning Commission, when they seek merely to give a directional touch to the proposals, they have been wise. It is my ambition, within the limited time that is at my disposal, if I continue to be here, to attempt in the spheres for which I am responsible, not merely to reach the targets but also to pass beyond. I think the Planning Commission has been rather wise in this matter. After all planning can only be directional and it cannot be anything more. If it is anything more, it has its own difficulties.

So far as the dhotis and sarees are concerned, I am quite prepared to admit any remarks or criticisms made by non. Members because I still have an open mind so far as reservation is concerned. As I have said, it is an experiment and it may succeed or it may not succeed. If it does not succeed, those people who want to put it through are wrong. If it does succeed, I can go a step further. They are perhaps to some extent right— So I am being very hesitant. Let us try it.

On the question of gradual extinction of handloom, it is rather difficult to say anything. In this life of ours where still the Darwin's theory persists in very many spheres, notwithstanding all the protection that Government could afford to the various units, there does seem to be some kind of struggle going on all the time. If we can altogether eliminate by Governmental intervention the existence of poor or very weak, the marginal element in our economy would naturally go, whether they are tea estates or whether they are handlooms or something else. An inefficient production unit, the sub-marginal element will go. All that we try is to keep the marginal element alive. That is the effort we are making. The Governmental help will be to keep the marginal element going. If my hon. friend Mr. Ghose assesses the handloom as being marginal in their graduation in our economic struggle. I think certainly they will live. But if they are sub-marginal, they will go. It also depends very largely on how the handloom weaver co-operates with us in the matter of production. We give him improved technique, we tell him how to present his goods. We help him financially; but if he still does not respond and says he will go to the gruel shop, we are helpless. Suppose they say, we do not want to get any quota cards, we propose to go to the gruel shop, we are helpless. So naturally the hand-loom weaver will go. This question of extinction can be related not to the industry but to individuals or to groups of individuals. If the hon. Member

restricts his prognostication only to individuals or groups of individuals, he will be right; but when he brings it to the whole industry, he is bound to be wrong, because he is then trying to generalise from a particular idea of his which he thinks has certain validity.

The second point which was raised in the speech of my hon. friend Prof. Ranga—for which I am grateful—is the one about the ways and means of finance from the Reserve Bank. This type of co-operative structure can only be helped with the ways and means position by the Reserve Bank by means of what they call rediscounting of their bills. This question of rediscounting of bills is yet in an infant stage in our country and it will have to grow. We feel, and I think the present Governor of the Reserve Bank does feel very strongly that the Reserve Bank can play a very great and important part in the development of co-operative institutions by encouraging this habit of rediscounting of bills made by cooperative institutions and ultimately the Reserve Bank approving of them. So if I am going to allow this Rs. 5-1/2 crores to be used as a nucleus for financing particular bodies, the ways and means position of that body, I think what I have is not enough. I do want this money to be utilised for cushioning the likely effects of price differences, the lack of technical facilities, the lack of technical ability or the lack of organisational strength, and this may not be provided by the cess, it may not be enough. So I do not want to curtail the scope of my activity by saying this shall also be used for creating a fund. The idea of creating a fund arises from the belief that Government's policy might change tomorrow, that Government may not be able to pay the money. That I claim is contrary to the present taxation measure which in spite of Mr. Kishen Chand's unwillingness support is definite, and in this case here we are perfectly earmarking a particular source of taxation, however wrong it may be from high principles, from the point of view of high prin-

ciples of public finance, earmarking money obtained from one branch of the industry for the purpose of developing a weaker branch of the industry. So I want this measure to be a permanent one. I do not want administrative difficulties, administrative cost which will multiply by having rate differences between different articles, to swallow up the earnings from this particular taxation. The whole idea « that this should be permanent

The other problem raised is this, and I think Prof. Ranga more or less anticipated what I was going to say. On the success or failure of this experiment, both in regard to khadi and with regard to handloom, will depend the amount of finance that Government will be able to place behind this effort. I think I am not committing my colleague the Finance Minister when I say that if this effort we make does solve the problem of unemployment to some extent, it would be open to us to provide more money, if money is needed, for the furtherance of our efforts in this direction. It does not necessarily mean that I raise the cess to 6 pies. We can find the money from other sources. After all the success of the measure is a very important thing and if it does solve unemployment, well the resources of the country, the resources of the Government will have to be utilised for the purpose of providing for more employment, for mitigating unemployment to some extent in the direction in which we have been successful. So to a large extent the availability of future finance will depend upon the success of this experiment. I do hope most earnestly—and I hope I am carrying the wishes of the hon. Members of this House when I say it—that this initial attempt will succeed and that you can ask me—have you succeeded? Do not let that good work stop merely because the Rs. 4 crores or Rs. 5 crores you get by this ; taxation is not enough. Please put in Rs. 4 to Rs. 5 crores so that the good work could live.

But, at the same time, I would like to tell my hon. friend Shri Bimal

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.] Comar Ghose that we have got to regulate the field so far as handloom is concerned. We cannot have slackness; we cannot have an onrush of people coming because the ship will fall plum. We have to find our way slowly and that is why we propose first to work only through co-operative societies, encourage all the weavers to come into the co-operative societies. We have to proceed slowly. If you say why not provide for development, you have got to wait, form a queue until we are ready to find you the employment necessary.

Sir, Mr. Mahanty—I hope he won't mistake me if I do not deal with him exhaustively—is sceptical. He says that the Fact Finding Committee's report has not been taken into consideration. That is a dead document ten years old and I was in touch with the organisation that was co-ordinating the Fact Finding Committee in those days. You cannot go on formulating policies and carrying them out on a report which is ten years old. So far as supply of yarn is concerned today the position is that we have ample yarn; the trouble is that they will not take them. He mentioned other things, he mentioned reservation of this and of that. All that will be done in course of time. Very possibly we will accept the recommendation made by this Textile Enquiry Committee and I am laying large store on the efforts of this Body in regard to our future policy towards handlooms.

Sir, I think that I have answered very many of the points mentioned by hon. Members in regard to handloom. In regard to khadi, Sir, I do not think I have got to add anything to what I said in the initial stage. Frankly, Sir, even there, I will assure my hon. friend Shri Tek Chand or Shri Narayan that if our efforts succeed and we are able to mitigate to some degree the degree of unemployment, we are prepared to bring more. It is not a question of there being any limitation or one crore of rupees only. But, we have no political ideas at all nor do we want to build up an :

army for fighting elections in the future unless it be that the common' man notwithstanding what all the people say, believes that khadi is something which is good and a man who wears khadi deserves his vote; then there is no objection. Members of the Praja Socialist Party or even the Communist Party Members can wear khadi and gain the confidence of the people that would arise therefrom. In fact, I remember one very small election I was fighting for a small body, a little thing. My opponent was a very powerful man and he spent about Rs. 12,000 and I spent Rs. 80 and I lost the election, needless to say. One of the persons who-voted against me came round the next morning and said 'I am sorry I voted against you. I did not know you were wearing khadi but when I saw you, I felt very sorry I voted against you.' That is possible notwithstanding all this ridicule and abuse that the khadi wearer does get nowadays. It might be that khadi might be a passport to success in an election. Well then, anybody can wear khadi. It may be that even a Communist who is not engaged in doing propaganda happens to get time and spins the charkha. naturally the organisation will buy from him and they will not refuse him the wage that he deserves. There is nothing to ridicule about it. We have got a band of workers who are so sincere and honest and have experience and are full of desire to do good and when we have got this band of people to help us, I think money should not stand in the way of our helping them and once again I express the gratitude of Government to these people notwithstanding the fact that we do not believe in the absolute, we do not believe really of a time when we are going to make all these mills close down and we are going to make the economy of the country a village economy and so believe that there is a proper place for the mill, for the machine. In a dynamic society you cannot keep a particular number of people static in a way. A man who is probably spinning today will spin for a couple

of years and if he finds some other lucrative employment he will go. We do not say, you stay on. If he gets a few rupees more somewhere by going into a workshop, let him go. We have got other people who are unemployed or under-employed. We do not think of any individual permanently engaged in this work. That is not what we are thinking of.

Nevertheless I feel very grateful to all those who offered to help us. I do not think that money is going to be a bottleneck in the furtherance of our efforts. Well, Sir, roughly I have made an attempt to survey the situation. When 19 hon. Members have spoken, it is very difficult for me to reply to every point. The only one which I would like to mention is this, that is, the question of spending this money. One hon. Member from Madras suggested that it should be proportionate to the number of looms in the country in a particular area. No, Sir, we are not going to think in terms of areas. We are going to think in terms of those people who join the co-operative societies. It is not on the basis of any particular area; it is the question of the presence of handloom weavers in a particular area rather than the area to which they belong. It is not a Grants Commission. This is not a Finance Commission. We are not adjudicating on the claims of rival areas; we are looking at the whole question from a human point of view. If a man with a handloom is prepared to come into a co-operative society and work, then we will help him. Distribution will be made on the basis of need, not on the basis of areas, nor on the basis of province or language. We do not mind whether he belongs to any particular caste, or whether he is a newcomer. If he comes into the co-operative society, he will get the same rights and privileges as anybody else. Provincial assessment of handlooms in any area does not at all come into the picture. Assessments will have to be made afresh, because they will have to be made on the basis of the number of members in each co-operative society. Also the

States will be free to go ahead. I am not going to say that we will give only so much to this State and we will not give so much to the other State. Whoever really takes advantage and whoever has got an organisational set-up will certainly get our help, and if the amount of money that is at my disposal is not sufficient, we will manage more. That is what I would like to say; the stress is not on the basis of areas, but it is on the basis of the number of people who are willing to come into co-operative societies.

Sir, once again, may I say, Sir, that I am very grateful to the hon. Members of this House for generally accepting the basic principles behind this measure and the type of work that we are endeavouring to do in the realisation of the proceeds of this tax.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the levy and collection of an additional duty of excise on cloth for raising funds for the purpose of developing khadi and other handloom industries and for promoting the sale of khadi and other handloom cloth, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration. The question is:

"That Clause 2 do stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Inait Ullah, are you moving your amendment?

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no amendment to clause 2.

(At this stage Shri J. R. Kappor stood up.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your amendment has come too late. I have ruled it out. I am not allowing any amendment now.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: I never suggested that I intend to move it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But there is no time. Hardly 40 minutes we have got.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: What are we to do? Clause 2 is so badly worded.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. But please be brief.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: Mr. Deputy Chairman, with all my support for this Bill I must confess that I am very unhappy at the very faulty phraseology of clause 2 of the Bill. A definition clause in a Bill is always the basis of the Bill and must be very carefully and properly drafted. As it is, however, Sir, I find that it is so badly drafted, so defectively drawn up, that in a very great measure it virtually defeats the purpose of this Bill. I am almost inclined to think that the hon. Minister in charge, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, has not had the time at his disposal to look into the phraseology of this clause; otherwise I am sure it would have been properly amended. We all know what a skilful and able draftsman he is. The whole Constitution of India on whose drafting commission he was an important member bears ample testimony to his great ability and skill as a draftsman. Therefore, I am inclined to think that he has had no time to look into the phraseology of this clause.

Let us take sub-clauses (a), (b), (c) and (d) one by one, and we shall find that they do not fulfil the object with which this Bill has been introduced. The object of this Bill is to aid and assist the handloom and khadi industry and to realise money for such assistance from mill-made cloth. But then, Sir, we find that though mill-made cotton cloth is to be subjected to a cess, mill-made woollen and silk cloth is not going to be subjected to any cess whatsoever. I do not know whether this was really the intention of Government or whether it is merely by an oversight that mills which produce silk cloth and mills which produce woollen cloth have been exempted altogether from the operation of this Bill.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: It is deliberate.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: If that is so, I would very much like to know the reason why. Why is there so much of softness on the part of Government for silk mills and woollen mills? I would very much like to know the reason. So far as silk khadi and woollen khadi are concerned, I am sure it is the intention of Government to help them. Is it not their intention? Well, surely, according to the definition of khadi and handloom cloth it appears that it is their intention to aid and assist the development of silk khadi and woollen khadi also. If that be so, why correspondingly mills which produce silk cloth and mills which produce woollen cloth should not have been subjected to a cess, I cannot understand. What is the logic behind this? I know my hon. friend Mr. Krishnamachari is not very much enamoured of logic this time. But then, if he does not necessarily want to be logical, I would very much like to know what humanitarian grounds there are for exempting silk mills and woollen mills from the operation of this Bill.

Secondly, as it appears from the definition, why is it that the Government wants to realise the cess from handloom factories? The intention is to aid and assist the development of the handloom industry. Why then realise the cess from handloom factories? If clause 2 and clause 3—with your permission I would incidentally refer to clause 3—remain as they are, it will be certainly not only open to but obligatory on the Government to realise the cess from handloom factories also, because I understand that though the word "factory" has not been defined in this Bill, what presumably is in the mind of the Government is that the word "factory" in this Bill shall have the same definition as the word has in the Factories Act. Now, according to the Factories Act, premises where 20 or more persons work is a factory. Now, if in a place only handlooms are used and the number of workers is 20 or more, then that becomes a factory,

and the handloom factory is subject to the provisions of this Bill. Is it really the intention of the Government to realise cess from handloom products where 20 or more persons are working? Here too, Sir, I see neither logic nor humanitarian grounds. I rather think, Sir, that this implication of the provisions goes contrary to the very object and purpose of the Bill.

Thirdly again, Sir, I would like to know what objection there is on the part of the Government to assist a person who produces cloth on two looms which are run by power, because according to clause 2(c) of this Bill, 'handloom cloth' has been defined as one which is produced on looms worked by manual labour. Now with the D.V.C. functioning with the Bhakra Nangal Project coming into being, we shall have ample electricity in large areas and surely it must be the intention of the Government to provide electricity in every little hamlet and cottage in such areas so that even a weaver having two or three looms may be able to run them with electricity. Now according to the definition of 'handloom industries' and 'khadi', it will not be open to the Government to give the slightest possible help under the provisions of this Bill to any such weaver. Now, I would like to know the reason if that is really the intention of the Government. If that be not and if it is merely an oversight, well, it is certainly very unfortunate; unfortunate all the more, Sir, because this Bill has been presented to us at this late stage for consideration when it is almost impossible for us to amend it in any manner whatsoever. This has got to be hurried through this time; it must be passed within half an hour or so and it must be enacted into a full-fledged legislation before midnight today and I can well understand, Sir, the embarrassment in which the Government might be placed if we insist on any reasonable, logical and rational amendment only in furtherance of the objects of this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Bill has been circulated to you long back.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: True, the Bill was circulated long back but these amendments could be taken up only today. If you will, Sir, bear with me for a minute, I am not suggesting that it was not circulated to us long in advance, but the fact is that we have to pass it today. Even if I had sent in a number of amendments even two or three days before, nothing could have happened. It would have been impossible for the Government to accept those amendments, however reasonable they would have been, because it was almost impossible for the other House to meet today before 12 midnight for their approval.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time now.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: Well, Sir, if you think that the Government could have done that, well and good, but if that be not so. I would suggest that these lacunae, these defects in clause 2 of the Bill must be remedied and if the hon. Minister in charge of the Bill does not plead want of time, then I am sure, reasonable always as he is, he would certainly look to these things and will be pleased to agree to the two or three amendments that I have suggested, a copy of which he must have already got by now. If however he thinks *on* merits that he is opposed to these amendments, it is entirely a different thing, but I am almost inclined to think that he is not opposed to these amendment? *on* merits, for they appear to be so very necessary and essential];: Sir

(Time bell rings.)

All right, Sir, you have rung the bell so harshly that I have been able to hear it in spite of my being a little hard of hearing and I *must* therefore resume *my* seat.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, the point is that my hon. friend thinks I am being unreasonable. I should say he is completely mistaken.

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari.] there. I will maintain, Sir, that these definitions have been very carefully looked into. Actually he seems to think that we should levy a cess on woollen and silken goods; I do not want to do it. There are powers under the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1934, under which this cess will be collected in the same manner. The return is going to be very small. I do not want to create a new administrative organisation and I am following in entirety the method of collection followed under the Central Excises and Salt Act of 1934. Therefore, he will understand then that we are following the same pattern there and we are not going to levy any cess on handloom factory, nor on powerlooms, nor on silk, nor on wool. He may not like it, but that is what we intend to do. And our intentions are clearly brought out by those definitions. I think it is administratively efficient and we can get on with the collection of this cess even under these definitions without the help of the amendments suggested by my hon. friend. I think those amendments are completely unnecessary and on merits I might say that I am unable to accept these amendments.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: I want to have an answer to my questions. In what way is it open to the Government not to realise the cess from handloom factory? I only want some clarification from the hon. Minister. Sir, on this subject. I understand that may be the intention. But will not the hands of the Government be absolutely tied down in that respect in view of what you say in clause 3 of the Bill that the cess must be realised from all cloth lying in stock on the appointed day in any factory and

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I have mentioned to the hon. Member that we are bound by the provisions of section 37, subsection (2), item 17 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1934. Whatever we had under that Act, we propose to do here and we have power to exempt all types of cloth

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: Sir, may I just

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No further questions. I am now putting the question to the House. (*Interruption.*) The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill "

The motion was adopted. Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now clause 3. No amendments. The question is—

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill "

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now clause 4. There are two amendments.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Sir, I want to move only the second amendment.

Sir, I move:

"That at page 2, after line 30, the following new sub-clause be inserted namely:—

'(h) providing of relief schemes for those engaged in the handloom industry.'

"

(*No speech was made.*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment moved:

"That at page 2, after line 30, the following new sub-clause be inserted, namely:—

'(h) providing of relief schemes for those engaged in the handloom industry.'"

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA: Sir, I beg to move:—

"That at page 2, after line 30, the following new sub-clauses be inserted, namely:—

'(b) assisting handloom industry by providing long-term cheap credit facilities to the manufacturers;

(i) helping the speedy disposal of handloom cloth by organising purchase-and-sale co-operative societies and subsidising them;

o) supplying yarn to handloom manufacturers at cheap rates;

(k) providing free rations and other benefits to handloom weavers if and when they are unemployed involuntarily due to non-availability of yarn or accumulation of stock or both."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does not 4(e) cover your point? '

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA: No, Sir, it is said in a general way.

Sir, it is admitted by all that the main problem confronting the hand-loom industry is the problem of disposing of the stocks. Even the hon. the Prime Minister in his speech at Madras in October last said that the main problem today is not that of production but that of disposing of the stuff that has been already produced. Now in my part of the country in South Kanara and Malabar handloom industry is run on a factory basis. There are factories employing hundreds of weavers. What is happening there actually is this. These handloom manufacturers have very little capital resources. Once they produce handloom cloth and dump the goods with the middlemen who are mostly monopoly dealers, they accumulate there. They are not sold speedily. The factory owners then are not able to continue the industry and they are not able to run the factories. They either cut the wages of the weavers or close down the factories completely and throw the workers completely on the streets. That is what is happening. Even the weavers who own their own looms are not able to continue their profession when their products are not sold readily. So the main problem today is to help the handloom weavers and the T?CSD

manufacturers to dispose of their stocks immediately after production. It is said that in Madras State alone the Provincial Weavers Co-operative Society has stocks worth four crores of rupees. Now the Government must immediately take steps to clear these stocks. Unless these stocks are cleared the industry will not survive. The first problem is to make the industry survive. Then only the question of development comes. So I suggest here that immediately assistance must be given to the handloom manufacturers to speedily dispose of their goods. Assistance must be given to the factory owners or the weaver owners also by way of cheap credit facilities to run their industry when their articles accumulate. Unless this is done the weavers will not be able to tide over the difficult times through which they are passing today. Secondly the difficulty with the handloom industry even today is the difficulty in getting yarn. For the last several years weavers were finding it very difficult to get their yarn requirements. There was shortage of yarn and also the price of yarn was very . exorbitant. Now also the difficulty is there to a great extent 50 to 60 per cent, of the cost of production of hand-loom cloth is accounted for by the cost of the yarn. So if the Government is serious about helping the handloom industry they must see that the hand-loom weavers and manufacturers get cheap yarn. It is said that in some places they were being supplied free yarn and that has been stopped now. But in my part of the country I have never heard of this free supply of yarn. Even if the Government are not able to supply free yarn to all and always, Government must somehow procure the yarn required by the handloom industry and supply it at cheap rates. It may be that Government will suffer some loss on this account but they can make up that loss by utilising a part of this cess that they are going to collect.

Then after supplying cheap yarn to the handloom industries. Government must buy over the stocks manufactured

[Shri B. V. Kakkilaya.] in handlooms and then arrange for their speedy sale. Even there it may be necessary to subsidise the sales and a portion of this as proceeds must be utilised for subsidising the industry. Lastly I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister that any measure to help the handloom industry must also help the handloom weavers who are working in the factories and who are today unemployed or are paid low wages. Minimum wages and human living conditions must be guaranteed to them. In Rayalaseema and other places they were providing gruel kitchens to unemployed weavers. Now they have been closed. Even if gruel kitchens cannot be opened in all places, in some places at least where famine conditions prevail, the Government must supply free rations through gruel kitchens or otherwise. In other places they must give all the benefits that a factory worker is entitled to get according to the various labour legislations. Unless these steps are taken by Government, all talk of helping the handloom industry and of further developing handloom industry will only *be* tall talk and the money that is collected here, I am afraid, will be wasted on fantastic schemes. Perhaps so many experts are already on their way to this country to man these researches and other schemes.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I am not moving my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendments moved:

"That at page 2, after line 30. the following new sub-clause be inserted namely:

'(h) providing of relief schemes for those engaged in the handloom industry'."

The next is:

"That at page 2, after line 30. the following new sub-clauses be inserted, namely:—

'(h) assisting handloom industry by providing long-term cheap credit facilities to the manufacturers;

(i) helping the speedy disposal of handloom cloth by organising purchase-and-sale co-operative societies and subsidising them;

(j) supplying yarn to handloom manufacturers at cheap rates;

(k) providing free rations and other benefits to handloom weavers if and when they are unemployed involuntarily due to nonavailability of yarn or accumulation of stock or both'."

The amendments and the clause are for discussion.

SHRI K. B. LALL (Bihar): Sir, I would not have spoken on this amendment had I been given a chance to speak earlier.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you supporting or opposing?

SHRI K. B. LALL: All the amendments are covered by the very first item in this clause and they may also be covered by (c) and (e) of this clause under maintaining or assisting in the maintenance of institutions for the development of khadi and other handloom industries and promoting the sale and marketing of khadi and other handloom cloth. What I want to suggest is this. On one occasion in the discussions on the Tariff Bill. I had pointed out that there are industries which have been dead or are dying in this country for which there have been no help and it was said at that time that on a suitable occasion that may be taken into consideration. Now I want to point out that there is nothing in this section to help and encourage the revival of those handloom industries which were neglected and which have almost died or dying.

I have read this section and the proposed amendments and all that. But for instance, I find nothing for the Bhagalpur Tassar industry which is on the way to its death. I do not know

whether this sub-clause or this clause will cover in any way that ancient and valuable industry, whether that will be helped. Although I did not give notice of any amendment, I think this amendment that is now before the House gives me an opportunity to speak on this point and the hon. Minister may explain in his reply the way in which he proposed to help such dying industries of our land which have been famous in our country.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: Sir, the first amendment moved by Mr. Rajagopal Naidu and the amendment of Mr. Kakkilaya to (h) and also to (k) are more or less out of the scope of the provision. As I have said the intention is to apply the amount to organise the industry, to cushion prices and to help the industry, not by giving out doles but by other means. We may run gruel centres or gruel kitchens; but I do not want the money merely to give gruel to weavers. There may be other means of giving relief to unemployment. It is then a problem of unemployment relief. This one here is only for helping the khadi and cottage industries. The intention of Mr. Kakkilaya's amendment also is to assist handloom industries by providing long-term cheap credit facilities to the manufacturers, by helping the speedy disposal of handloom cloth by organising purchase-and-sale co-operative societies and subsidising them, supplying yarn to handloom manufacturers at cheap rates; providing free rations and other benefits to handloom weavers if and when they are unemployed etc. etc We are supplying all these types of aid and they are all covered by (a). After all, hon. Members will realise that the words in the clause are "and in particular, measures for". These are the particular measures and in the general measures all these can be envisaged, unless it be said that the proceeds should go towards paying out doles which the Central Government would not agree to. Such things will come separately as unemployment and other reliefs. Otherwise I think the provisions already there cover what is sought

by these amendments. You are not going to embellish or decorate this particular measure by adding this clause; it is all there in (a), (f) and (g).

With regard to Shri K. B. Lall's desire if the Bihar Government includes his desire in a scheme for handloom cloth organisation and support, I shall certainly be very pleased to accept any suggestion that may come from them. Primarily my hon. friend must get his counterpart in the Bihar Assembly to move that Government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want to have your amendment put to vote, Mr. Rajagopal Naidu?

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: On a point of personal explanation, Sir. The hon. Minister seems to be under the impression that the purpose of the amendment is to provide for some sort of doling out to the weavers. I do not mean that sort of assistance. I only want that the weavers should be helped with long-term credit for the purpose of enabling them to become members of co-operative societies in supplying yarn to the handlooms.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: It is all there in (a), (f) and (g).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want me to put your amendment to vote?

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: No. I may be allowed to withdraw it.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And Mr. Kakkilaya?

SHRI B. V. KAKKILAYA: I would like to withdraw it, Sir.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That Clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: I have to say something about this.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: At this hour?

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: I have suggested to the Government in my amendment that the Government may make rules regarding the manner in which the Central Government and State Governments shall check the manufacturers and dealers of handloom cloth and khadi from mixing, adulterating and selling handloom cloth for khadi, or khadi for handloom cloth. If the Government cannot accept this amendment, I think the Minister may assure the House that by laws he will see that khadi is not sold as handloom cloth and handloom cloth is not sold as khadi because he is now going to help the khadi cloth. If he cannot accept my amendment, I think I will be satisfied if he will assure us that he will make such rules that handloom will not be sold for khadi.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Am I to take it that you have moved the amendment.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: He is speaking.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are not moving your amendment?

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH: No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. Minister got to say anything.

SHRI T. T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I can assure my hon. friend Khwaja Inait Ullah that in this matter of keep-

ing khadi unadulterated I should be guided largely by the advice given by the All-India Khadi Board and I think my hon. friend may move that body to see that the purity is not disturbed. I know what is disturbing the mind of my hon. friend and I think it is very safe that they are very jealous of it.

SHRI J. R. KAPOOR: I think we have got the Khadi Act under which adulteration can be checked.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That Clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Mahanty, are you moving your amendment?

SHRI S. MAHANTY: Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have already spoken. Just move the amendment.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I have to make one or two observations while moving the amendment. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I move

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mahanty, I think your amendment will be now out of order because the House has accepted the other clauses where khadi has been used.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That Clause 1. the Title and the Enacting Formula stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

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

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

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion is:

"That the Bill be passed."

SHRI B. C. GHOSE: Sir, it was my ill-fortune that the hon. Minister was not here when I spoke because it appears that in certain points he was misinformed and certain observations, particularly in regard to the marginal and sub-marginal forms, have created some confusion in my mind and I would admit that the fault is my own. What I wanted to know is this, supposing the Committee which the Government had set up finds that handloom cloth cannot compete with mill-made cloth then what would be the policy of Government? What is marginal and sub-marginal will depend also to a large extent upon any subsidies or other forms of assistance that the Government might render to these industries. What is sub-marginal might become marginal and what is marginal might be quite competitive depending upon the assistance offered by the Government. Now, have Government formulated a policy on that. If, on general competitive conditions, without any assistance being given, it is found that the handloom cloth cannot compete with mill-made cloth will the Government, in those conditions come to support the handloom industry and particularly the khadi industry? That is the main question because, otherwise, I believe that generally, by and large, handloom cloth and khadi cannot have a large market. They can have specialised markets. Have Government any policy on all these matters.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. Mr. Mahanty.

SHRI S. MAHANTY: I will take one or two minutes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, even at this late stage, I should like to make one observation that this Bill has been motivated by one reason and one reason alone, to mitigate the unemployment

problem but the attempt is only a mere tinkering with the problem. When we come to unemployment and when we take khadi in that context, what do we find? If the Minister cares only to answer the following questions, then the position will be self-explanatory. One is to what extent khadi serves unemployment and under-employment problems. That is number one and number two is, what is its total production and how many people are engaged in it, and the third is whether khadi is cheaper than mill cloth? The Minister has admitted that logic does not come into play in his consideration and, if, for the time being, he gets over all his prejudices and pre-conceived views with the objectivity of an intellectual as he seems abundantly to be I would like to ask him by what logic and by what reason khadi should be included in this scheme for protection

Secondly, it is no good tinkering with the problem. I do admit that hand-looms provide employment to about 10 million people and there is no gainsaying the fact that the unemployment problem is every day assuming greater and greater proportions. Therefore I would suggest that the entire textile industry be decentralised. The mills should be engaged only in producing cloth for export, while to meet our internal consumption more powerlooms should come into operation. As the hon. Minister would have known, the powerlooms emerged out of a triangular contest between the mills, the khaddar and the handlooms, and the very fact that powerlooms are on the increase shows abundantly clearly that powerlooms can solve the problem by decentralising the entire textile industry. Therefore I would urge even at this late stage, firstly, to omit khadi from the purview of this Bill and secondly not to be guided by sentiments

which have no basis in reality, but to decentralise the entire textile industry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister.

MR. H. P. SAKSENA: Just a minute. Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called upon the hon. Minister to reply.

MR. H. E. SAKSENA: I have only just a small point, Sir. It is in regard to the title of the Bill. Now whether the title of the Bill is long or whether the title is short, why is the word "short" always used? The Khadi and other Handloom Industries Development (Additional Excise Duty on Cloth) Bill, 1953, is surely not a short title. How is it always the words 'short title' are used?

SHRI T.T. KRISHNAMACHARI: I am sorry I misunderstood my hon. friend Shri B. C. Ghose. Maybe, if I had heard him, what I said may not be quite accurate. The broad fact really is that there is no point in anticipating what the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee would be and trying to meet a point which is now purely a matter of conjecture. But even so we can say that the Textile Enquiry Committee is largely a body to assess areas or spheres could be defined and kept apart; whether there is going to be a transference or change from one industry to another: how do we effect it; questions of nationalisation of mill industry and so on. The problem of handloom industry is not sub-marginal, but marginal. And with a certain amount of subsidy, as my hon. friend rightly put it, we can make it a marginal industry. But for the future we have to keep it going so long as it goes on employing 20 lakhs of people. The employment problem is the main problem, more than the industrial problem. The artistic side can be kept alive by creating a market for artistic goods. People who are engaged in weaving artistic things may be five to seven lakhs. We can keep them going by means of presentation goods. But the other side is the employment problem. It may be that some time later when electricity is cheap we can convert these looms into powerlooms. We do not want that they should work for 10 hours a day if they could get the

same amount of money by working six hours a day. But, now, I am merely guessing and there is no point in my indulging in guesses. That is the basic problem, and we will consider the problem as a whole. But here we recognise the fact that these people must be kept going no matter what it costs, whether it is by means of the cess or by means of reservations or by some other measures that we can devise, so that we can keep them going. They must be kept going. That is the primary object.

In regard to the other question raised by my hon. friend Mr. Mahanty, he goes back to fundamentals every time. If you do that, you must stop all the mills and decentralise everything. Why should I? I am not taking a view of asceticism. I am not reshaping the entire country into the pattern which I like. Do not try to pose dilemmas: Either do this, or do that. There are a number of things in between which we can do. It may be that I do not want to be very logical; but I do not want to be absurd—if that is the idea of my hon. friend in posing the dilemma: "Well, you are on the horns of a dilemma; you just choose." If he says that, well, I will say that my hon. friend's capacity for posing dilemmas is not particularly, shall I say, commendable.

I do not think that so far as khadi is concerned I need mention that it is a matter of helping people whom we cannot help in any other manner. If there are people who can go to some other type of work, naturally, they would not be there in the khadi industry which pays only 8 or 10 annas. Probably if he goes to a mill or some other place where he can earn Rs. 5 or Rs. 6 or Rs. 7, naturally he will go. There is the Standard Wagon Works in Asansol where there are people who work with their hands, people with a certain amount of technical ability, who earn Rs. 500 a month. That is what I want the people to do. I do not want them to earn 10 annas a day for all

their lifetime. We do want them to switch over to some other gainful employment. But when we cannot provide that, at least this will help. That is a fact, and there is no gainsaying that at all.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:—

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 8-15 A.M. tomorrow.

The Council then adjourned till a quarter past eight of the clock on Wednesday, the 15th April 1953.